

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> CXXVII. *APRIL* 1907.

---

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW: PAST  
AND PRESENT.

OCTOBER 1875—APRIL 1907.

It is just thirty-two years since a circular letter issued by Mr. A. J. B. Beresford Hope and Dean Church announced on February 5, 1875, the determination to found the *Church Quarterly Review* to 'contain original articles on religious, theological, Biblical, liturgical and ecclesiastical subjects; full reviews and also short notices of books and communications.' The original promoters recognized the desire which was keenly felt at the time for a Review which 'might set forth the results of real study and reflection on the highest of all subjects, in such a manner as to be worthily representative of the teaching and position of the Church of England and of other Churches in full communion with her,' and urged that 'considering the revived energy of the great Anglican Communion, and the keen interest everywhere displayed in religious subjects, it ought certainly to be possible to create and to maintain such an organ. Other religious bodies, and even sceptics, have shown their ability to plan and carry out such a design.'

As we enter with the present number upon our sixty-fourth volume it seems to us that after the lapse of a

generation the need to which attention was called in 1875 is still as great as ever, and that no other existing periodical supplies it exactly in the same way as the *Church Quarterly* has endeavoured to do. There never was a time when religious questions were more keenly debated, and the enormous multiplication of journals of all kinds and shades of opinion during the past ten years has quickened popular interest in a manner and to an extent which might well have seemed incredible. This widening of the circle of interest has made the dissemination of sound knowledge all the more necessary. The remarkable results of improved methods of study in science and history have made a deep impression upon the minds of all thoughtful men, and it is not surprising that the right should be claimed to apply similar methods in other fields. The clergy, if they value that which is entrusted to them, cannot afford to be ignorant of what those who listen to them are reading and thinking about. The 'reconciliation' of religion and science has become to many minds a problem of the most serious perplexity, and the introduction of the methods of critical investigation in dealing with the historical portions of the Old and New Testaments with which people have become increasingly familiar since the publication of *Lux Mundi* has raised questions upon which accurate information and sound guidance are earnestly desired. Restatements of doctrine in the terms of modern ideas to meet the needs of modern life are said to be necessary, but it must be remembered that they must be based upon the results of sound learning informed with sober reverence and spiritual insight if they are really to satisfy. In Apologetic literature there is very much which needs to be done, and in Biblical study an effort must be made to distinguish between the true and the false, between what is established and what is merely hypothetical in the conclusions which are being gradually worked out in England and on the Continent. That something may be done in this way we have endeavoured to shew from the historical side by articles such as that on 'Criticism Rational and Irrational' (October 1902), the series upon the Synoptic



Problem and on the Fourth Gospel,<sup>1</sup> the studies on 'The Virgin Birth of Christ' (October 1904) and the 'Evidence for the Resurrection' (January 1906), besides those in the last two numbers on 'The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles' (October 1906, January 1907), and in the present one on 'The Gospel History and its Transmission.' On the philosophical side we may refer to 'A New Way in Apologetic' (January 1905) and the three contributions on 'Liberal Theology,'<sup>2</sup> as well as to a very large number of Short Notices.

But it is not merely with regard to fundamental questions that discussion is rife. The necessity of adapting the administrative methods of the Church to the changed conditions of the times is becoming more and more urgent. Towns like Middlesbrough have grown in a few years from a population which was numbered in hundreds to more than 100,000 inhabitants, and everywhere great cities are stretching out their arms to take in what were once sparsely populated country districts. The efforts of all the religious bodies together have failed to keep pace with the movement of the people. As was pointed out a year ago in dealing with the 'Training of Candidates for Holy Orders' (April 1906), there is a need not merely of more men but of men educated and trained with a greater regard for their future efficiency in their high calling. The Home Mission work of the Church such as was dealt with in relation to the 'Needs of South London' (April 1903), and of Liverpool and of Birmingham in other articles, has to some men little of the glamour of Foreign Missions, but both alike are indispensable, and neither can be properly carried on by agents scanty in number and inadequately equipped.

During the last five years alone we have tried to indicate the requirements of mission work in India, in Africa, Australia, Newfoundland, Japan and China in a series of contributions from men who have devoted their lives to the countries of which they write; and there are still many fields

<sup>1</sup> 'The Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels,' April 1903, Jan. and July 1904, Jan. 1905: 'The Fourth Gospel,' I.-III. April-Oct. 1905.

<sup>2</sup> Oct. 1905, Jan. and July 1906.

to be dealt with. The account of Missions to Hindus, of Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and the work of the Universities Mission and other Missions in Central Africa will be found to give some idea of the kind of problems which the missionaries have to solve and the religious beliefs of those among whom they work.<sup>1</sup> And as will be seen from those articles and from that on Lay Readers in the last number, special emphasis has been laid upon the opportunities both at home and abroad for the exercise of the priesthood of the laity, not as a mere figure of speech but as a living reality. There is need, and there is certainly ample room, for the energy and devotion of workers of all kinds ; and at the same time there is certainly room for improved methods of organization and administration. The necessity for the increase of the diocesan episcopate was one of the first reforms which was urged by the *Church Quarterly* on its foundation, and we are thankful to have been able by refusing to allow the subject to sink into the background to do something to help in a movement whose importance is steadily impressing itself on the minds of Churchmen. It is true that some at least, whose opinions are entitled to be heard with the greatest respect, do not look with favour upon the proposals. It is urged that the result will be a lowering of the standard of those who are raised to the episcopate and a considerable increase of what is bluntly described as 'fuss.' We do not believe that either misgiving would be realized ; and in any case it is surely too much to expect that the oversight of the dioceses of England to-day can be exercised efficiently by a body of men, however devoted, who are but little more numerous than they were in the reign of Henry VIII. If it were not for the self-sacrificing labours of the suffragan

<sup>1</sup> The following articles, among others, may be referred to :— 'Missions to Hindus,' July-Oct. 1902, April 1903, Jan. 1905 ; 'Buddhist India,' July 1904 ; 'Mohammed and the Rise of Islam,' July 1906—a study to which we venture to call special attention ; 'The Church in South Africa,' Oct. 1903 ; 'Missions in Nyasaland,' Jan.-April 1906 ; 'Notes on the Church in Australia,' Oct. 1903 ; 'The Church in Newfoundland,' July 1905 ; 'Japan and Western Ideas,' April 1904 ; 'The Real Yellow Peril,' Oct. 1906.



bishops the case would be even more glaring than it is ; while on the other hand we must set the undeniable increase in spiritual activity and enthusiasm in the cities which have been given a chief Pastor whom they could really regard as their own Father-in-God.

It seems well worthy of consideration whether this policy would not do something also to remedy what is represented in some quarters as a state of anarchy alleged to exist among a large section of the clergy of the Church of England in matters of practice and discipline. We deal in the present number with the burning question of Ecclesiastical Courts and the reasons for which they fail to command obedience, but, as we pointed out last October in dealing with the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, there is no reason to believe that the number of really 'disloyal' clergy is other than very small. What is required is a method of exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction which Churchmen would recognize as valid, and that it should be humanly possible for the bishops to 'visit' their clergy that they may correct what is done amiss or omitted to be done and may encourage them in the work which they are doing their best to perform. Much harm has been caused in the past by attempts to solve difficult problems by rough-and-ready methods, and there is a real danger, as we have indicated, of ill-considered legislation which must prove alike disastrous in its immediate consequences and ineffectual to a permanent solution because, just as in the successive attempts at legislation on the Education question to which our pages have borne witness, it disregards the conscientious convictions of a considerable section of the people.

In dealing with Home Missions in England and with the work of the Church in distant lands we have not forgotten countries which are linked to us by alliance or friendship or by closer bonds of union. In the articles on the United Free Church of Scotland (October 1901) and on the Crisis caused by the result of the Appeals in 1903-4 (January 1905) we have attempted an estimate of the meaning of 'freedom' in this connexion. Nor have we been unmindful of the two

Churches in communion with our own in Scotland and in Ireland. The needs of the Church of Ireland and its methods of administration in its altered circumstances were fully described in an article eighteen months ago, and in two recent studies we have put forward what we believe to be the requirements both of justice and efficiency in relation to the burning question of the 'Reform of Trinity College, Dublin,' and the satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of Irish Roman Catholics for a University of their own worthy of the name.<sup>1</sup> On the Continent the religious situation in France has been made the subject of careful study and has been dealt with in a series of articles on the 'Catholic Reaction,' 'Religion and Politics' (July 1902), 'Christian Socialism in France' (April 1904), and one upon the early stages of the present crisis (April 1905), with which we deal further in this number. In the case of Germany we have studied—we trust, to some profit—her methods of education, secular and religious, in articles dealing with our own system, and her contributions to science and theology and history have been discussed in very many reviews. The study of the Religious Condition of Italy in October 1902, and of the life and character of the late Pope Leo XIII. (July 1903) by a very well known writer will be within the recollection of many of our readers.

Some indication has been given above of the way in which an attempt has been made to deal with the many questions which interest and the problems which confront the minds of Churchmen, both clergy and laity alike. The account might be largely extended, for we have made no mention of the valuable series of liturgical and doctrinal studies, such as Mr Darwell Stone's recently republished contributions on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, or the account in the two last numbers of the old Mozarabic Liturgy of the Church of Spain with the curious light which

<sup>1</sup> 'A Roman Catholic University for Ireland,' July 1901; 'The Three Churches in Ireland,' Oct. 1902; 'The Financial Position of the Church of Ireland,' July 1905; 'Irish University Education and the Reform of Trinity College, Dublin,' Oct. 1906; 'A University for Cork,' Jan. 1907.



it throws upon many points of interest. These articles are written by specialists, but they are not intended merely *for* specialists, and no pains have been spared—for example, in the last article containing the Mozarabic Mass in English—to smooth the path of the ordinary reader who may chance to take any interest at all in liturgical questions. It is the needs of the ordinary educated reader, whether cleric or layman, which have been kept in view throughout. It has been the constant aim of the *Church Quarterly* to do more than deal with exclusively theological and ecclesiastical subjects. In Philosophy and History, in Music and Art, in Literature and Science it has endeavoured to give a comprehensive survey of the movements of modern times. We should like to refer to the recent articles entitled ‘A Philosophy of Phrases’ (January 1904), ‘The Oxford School of Historians’ (October 1904), ‘Creighton and Stubbs’ (October 1905), ‘Church Music’ (January 1906), ‘The Golden Age of Classic Christian Art: the Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore’ (October 1905), ‘Recent Excavations in Crete’ (January 1906), ‘The Life of Sir E. Burne-Jones’ (July 1905), ‘Pre-Raphaelitism’ (April 1906), ‘Mr. Stanley Weyman’s Novels’ (January 1905), ‘School Tales’ (January 1906), ‘Some Modern French Literature,’ in the last number, and ‘Weissmann and the Theory of Descent’ (October 1905), as an example of what has been done in more lengthy studies; while in the Short Notices an effort has been made to supply reviews of many thousands of volumes in a manner which should convey real information without undue technicality, and be scholarly without being dull. That this aim has been achieved with some measure of success is shewn by the keen interest with which, as we have reason to know, our Short Notices—some of them, it must be admitted, of considerable length—are read by a very large number of our readers.

On the eve of a new departure it may not be amiss to take stock once more of the past. With the exception of our two great contemporaries the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*, no Review perhaps has ever been more fortunate in its contributors. As is well known, although the first

two numbers contained two signed articles,<sup>1</sup> the general policy of the *Church Quarterly* has been to preserve a strict anonymity, leaving to its contributors the responsibility of subsequently avowing their authorship if they so desire. This course has many advantages both theoretical and practical which will occur to everyone, and in the case of questions of policy it is both convenient and desirable that the utterance should be that of the *Church Quarterly Review* rather than of any individual contributor, however distinguished. But, apart from this, there are a number of historical, scientific and literary subjects, upon which, as will have been seen, we are accustomed to publish contributions, where the acknowledged reputation and learning of the writer, or the interest of his personality give to his words a claim to attention and consideration which they not infrequently fail to obtain in an anonymous article. We confess to have read, not without a certain grim appreciation, critiques of articles in our pages in which our anonymous contributor, more than once the greatest living authority on his subject, has been solemnly warned of the dangers of a smattering of knowledge. It is in recognition of this fact and in deference to the wishes of a large number of readers that it has been decided to admit within the limits indicated a certain number of *signed* articles in future. In any case it has been inevitable that the authorship would be disclosed in course of time by a writer or his representatives. As we pointed out in a former survey, it is now well known that the review in two articles (January 1877, January 1878) of Sir Theodore Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort* was by Mr. Gladstone; but it has not, we believe, hitherto been stated that he also wrote the first article which ever appeared in our pages—that on 'Italy and her Church.' Indeed the first ten numbers of the *Review* contained no fewer than four contributions from his pen, including besides those already mentioned the article on Dr. Norman Macleod. The same numbers contained also five articles

<sup>1</sup> 'The Present Position of the Irish Church,' Oct. 1875, by the Bishop of Derry (now Archbishop of Armagh); 'Dean Howson *Before the Table*,' Jan. 1876, by the Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope.



by Miss Charlotte Yonge, on 'Sunday-School and Lending-Library Literature,' 'Magazine Literature,' 'The World of Fiction,' 'Harriet Martineau' and 'Continental Culture,' while among her numerous later contributions may be mentioned the account of two Scottish Bishops (Bishops Jolly and Gleig) and the two very touching articles entitled 'The Spiritual Needs of Invalids' (October 1879), and 'Heroines of Charity' (July 1880). The article on the Public Worship Regulation Act, like those on the Ridsdale Judgement and on the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, and a number of others were by Mr. Beresford Hope. The important and delicate questions involved in the relationship of Church and State were dealt with in a number of contributions by Sir Robert Phillimore and other eminent legal authorities. Dean Church's authorship of the study of 'The Letters of Pope Gregory I' (April 1881), has already been disclosed, but he also wrote on 'Cassiodorus' (July 1880), and a large number of Short Notices. Dr. Liddon's estimate of the 'Recent Fortunes of the Church in Oxford' (April 1881) was generally identified from the significant omission of all mention of his name among the influences upon religious thought in Oxford which are there described. He also contributed an article on 'Egyptian Christianity' (January 1887), and numerous reviews of books. Among other writers now dead we may mention Dr. Eales, the late Bishop Lyttelton, Canon Meyrick, Canon Perry, Canon Venables, Canon Overton (whose contributions are well known), Dean Lake, Canon Aubrey Moore, Bishop Cotterill of Edinburgh, Judge O'Connor Morris and Canon Travers Smith. The last named was an unfailing friend to the Review from the first, and wrote many articles in it. Among yet others Dr. Littledale's articles on the Legal Basis of the Petrine Claims and kindred subjects are well known, and many of those by Dr. Bright have been republished in book form. Dr. Bright's contributions were very numerous and very varied in character, ranging—to take only four successive numbers at random—from 'The Ornaments Rubric and the Vestments' (October 1883), to 'English Hymnology' (April 1884), 'Christianity in

Egypt,' in the same number, and the study of 'A New Attack on the Athanasian Creed' (July 1884). It will surprise no one who is acquainted with the extraordinary facility of writing which he combined with vast learning to be told that on one occasion the Editor received from him within the space of twelve days three masterly articles upon three entirely different subjects, all composed in a few weeks. Among other individual contributions it is interesting to point further to one on 'Parochial Missions' (October 1876), by Mr. Walsham How, afterwards the dearly loved Bishop of East London, on the work of the London Lay Helpers' Association (July 1883), by Mr. George Spottiswoode, 'Retreats' (July 1879), by the late Dean Randall of Chichester, 'John Wyclif at Oxford' (October 1877), by the late Bishop Creighton, and a characteristic and noteworthy article 'How can Cathedrals best further the Culture of Church Music?' (January 1879), by Mr. (afterwards Sir) John Stainer.

We have perforce passed over many deeply interesting articles, for, as we ventured to point out in a former survey, the *Church Quarterly* has endeavoured to meet each important crisis which is of moment to Churchmen in a sober judicial spirit and with a well considered policy. Many of the most distinguished writers who have helped us by their counsel and their contributions are happily still living, and therefore may not be named here; but it has been the good fortune of the successive Editors to have numbered among contributors to articles and Short Notices alike very many of the highest authorities on ecclesiastical and historical and general subjects in the last generation, and, we will venture to add, in the present also.

In bringing this brief survey of our work to a conclusion we desire to urge upon our readers that if in lowering the price of the Review those who are responsible for it have taken a hazardous step they have done it in the belief that there are very many to whom its former price presented a serious obstacle in the way of becoming subscribers, and to ask therefore for the cordial support in the new venture of



all those who have at heart the objects which the *Church Quarterly Review* was founded to promote.

Since the above was written we have received many very kind replies to the circular with regard to the proposed change which was sent to our subscribers, and we desire to thank them for the pleasant manner in which with very few exceptions they have spoken of our work. They have recognized that even if in some points the advance in knowledge has entailed a change in the attitude of the Review, we have throughout remained loyal to those Catholic principles which it was founded to promote. As regards the changes proposed, it is not unnatural that the majority should approve a change which will make subscription to the Review easier, but it has been very gratifying to find that a very large number of those who have replied are willing to help us on our way by taking two numbers for a time—one for themselves and one for the benefit of some distant friend to whom we offered to send it. It may perhaps be permitted to add that in more than one case this promise of support would have been more effective had the sender not forgotten to give his name and address.

A word may be said with regard to the replies so far as they concern the character and contents of the Review. A certain number of subscribers fear the change lest we should be compelled by it to lower the standard of the *Church Quarterly* articles; a certain number ask us to remember that the clergy as a body would like something much more popular in character. We would answer both by saying that we do not intend to lower the standard. The price is being lowered because it is believed that the majority of those who wish to read the *Church Quarterly Review* will always be clergy (we say the majority, *not all*, for we have many most generous and sympathetic supporters among the laity), and that their incomes will not in these days allow them to pay the subscription which has hitherto been asked. We believe, and certainly the answers received justify the belief, that there is a large body of clergy and laity who are not afraid of our pages because we are some-

times rather academic, sometimes rather learned (we try not to be Dryasdusts), and because we attempt to discuss serious questions in a serious way.

Other advice which we have received is a little conflicting. Some would have us reduce the length of the articles, others would have us increase it. We intend to make no change. Some subscribers like signed articles, others do not. Shall we please both or neither by having some signed, some unsigned? We have given above the reasons which have led us to adopt the change which we are making in this respect: we will only add that we shall not necessarily hold ourselves responsible for everything which may be said in articles which are signed, while we shall admit on the other hand no article whose general tenour is inconsistent with the principles of the *Church Quarterly*.

Lastly there are a few subscribers who seemed to be inspired by the correspondence concerning the *Times* Book Club with the belief that there is 'villany somewhere' and that some unknown persons are reaping exorbitant profits. We can only reply that we have paid our printer's bills and a modest sum to our contributors, but that the large profits exist only in our subscribers' imaginations. Our new enterprise will require considerable capital which is to be contributed on a commercial basis: to be successful we must have at least 3,000 subscribers; if we are unsuccessful the Review must cease to exist. We believe, however, that the *Church Quarterly* has a part, and a valuable part, to play in the life of the Church of England, and that the reduced price will be a real gain to the clergy. May we appeal once more to our friends (and we have reason to know that we have good friends) to do all that they can to make our enterprise successful?

---



## ART. I.—ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

1. *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. London. 1883.
2. *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Majesty. London. 1906. Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office by Wyman & Sons, Limited, Fetter Lane, E.C.

IN the *Church Quarterly Review* for last October we considered at some length the findings of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.<sup>1</sup> It is, however, impossible to embrace the whole field of so extensive an inquiry in a single article, and so far as one, and that not the least important, part of the Recommendations was concerned we were obliged to be satisfied with pointing out that the Commissioners had justified the contention that the existing Ecclesiastical Courts both violated constitutional usage and failed to command much respect, and with quoting the Recommendations in which they suggested remedies for this condition of affairs.

The Royal Commission, it will be remembered, was instructed not only 'to inquire into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the Law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of churches,' but also 'to consider the existing powers and procedure applicable to such irregularities.' It will surprise no one who is acquainted with the history, of which the appointment and report of the Commission are the last stage, to learn that the consideration to which they were thus directed has led to the conclusion that 'the present structure of the ecclesiastical judicature, taken as a whole, is one chief cause of the growth of ritual irregularities in the Church of England.'<sup>2</sup> We propose to devote a few

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1906, pp. 1-39.

<sup>2</sup> Report, p. 70, par. 381.

pages to a careful examination of this finding, and of the Recommendations which are based upon it.

It is, we believe, the truth that in the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts is to be found the principal, if not the sole, explanation of a state of things of which explanation is certainly much needed. To be told that a very large number of the clergy of the Church of England systematically defy the law, would be, if it were not so familiar to our ears, exceedingly startling; and the statement becomes still more perplexing when it is added that the clergy are systematically abetted in this defiance by the bishops. To many indeed of the witnesses called before the Commission all this seems not only unquestionable in point of fact but perfectly simple and natural, in no way differing from the attitude towards the law of other criminal classes—coiners, burglars, and the like; as little needing explanation; and calling merely for the same unhesitating repression. We are not sure that down to a late stage of the inquiry the minds of one or two of the Commissioners were not much in the same condition. It would, we think, be mere waste of time to discuss the position of people who are content to look no deeper than this. No intelligent observer, whatever may be his religious opinions, can doubt that the continued prevalence, throughout a long period, of ‘disorders’ and ‘lawlessness’ among such a class of men as the bishops and clergy of the Church of England is a matter which cannot be thus summarily disposed of, and is indeed a symptom of some defect in our ecclesiastical system for which, if the Church is to be preserved in health, a remedy must sooner or later be found. If we turn to those witnesses who represent another school in the Church, we shall find that they put forward an explanation which, whether we agree with it or not, has at least the merit that it recognizes that there is something to be explained. They say that it is of the essential nature of a Church that she should herself declare and define her own law. They say that this not only has always been the doctrine of the Church of Christ, but also is the theory of the law and constitution of England. They say that, nevertheless, the law of the



Church is in fact—rather by a succession of oversights than by legislation framed on any deliberate policy—ultimately determined by a tribunal which represents not the Church but the State; that this tribunal, being established in violation of the fundamental principle already mentioned, is wholly without authority to determine the law; and that consequently its decisions are not binding *in foro conscientiae*. It is further added that the defective title of the court of ultimate appeal affects, at least in some degree, the courts which are subordinate to it and bound to follow its decisions. It follows that, the only existing Courts being illegitimate, there is no working machinery by which the law of the Church can be authoritatively declared.

Now whether we consider this position to be sound or not, the fact that it is held by a large section of the Church sufficiently accounts for the state of things which the Royal Commission was appointed to investigate. It is useless to tell a man to obey the law, when what you mean by the law is the decision of a Court whose authority to declare the law he holds himself bound on high grounds of principle and conscience to deny. It is evident that, if there be no duly authorized means of ascertaining the law, a man must in the last resort act upon his own view of what the law is; or perhaps we should say that, human nature being what it is, he will act upon his own view of what the law ought to be. That this is precisely the existing condition of the Church of England needs, we think, no proof. It is literally and truly a condition of anarchy, modified only by the personal influence of the bishops and the reluctance of the reasonable among the clergy to push matters to extremities.

We do not, of course, overlook the fact that means exist by which the law as declared by the present Courts can be actually enforced upon those who disobey it. Many of those who gave evidence before the Royal Commission appear to think that the only reform needed is to make this process easier and cheaper. But there is nothing in the machinery of the Courts (however much it may be susceptible of improvement) which accounts for the fact that as the result of fifteen or twenty years of litigation, during

which the whole force of the law was brought to bear, and, so far as technical result went, successfully brought to bear, upon the practices condemned by the final court, all those practices have steadily increased in use, and at the same time the policy of prosecution for ritual and ceremonial offences has been, by the almost universal consent of all parties, practically abandoned. The true reason is altogether different. We of this present age have no stomach for persecution, and a sufficiently determined body of really conscientious conviction upon any subject will render inoperative the most drastic legislation which Parliament can devise. Yet those who represented the attack before the Commission persisted throughout in attributing the practical failure of prosecutions for ritual offences to defects in the procedure (mostly imaginary, as they were very frequently reminded by Sir Lewis Dibdin, and as the Commissioners find<sup>1</sup>) and shut their eyes resolutely to the real cause, the impossibility of overriding by force, even with the most effective procedure in the world, the conscientious conviction of a body of men who, on these witnesses' own shewing, amount to something like half the clergy, and are supported by a considerable number of the most zealous among the laity. It appears to us plain that, whether the question is approached from the point of view of the churchman who believes that the Church is a Divine Society and not a department of the State, or from that of the practical statesman who aims merely at securing peace and efficiency, no solution of the problem is worth considering which does not recognize the position which we have attempted to describe. The churchman believes that in the main that position is sound; the statesman knows that as a practical matter it is impossible to ignore it.

It is necessary, before discussing the manner in which the Royal Commission has dealt with the problem as it stands to-day, to recapitulate shortly the history. Down to quite modern times the discipline of the clergy formed a very small part of the business of our Ecclesiastical Courts. The practitioner in those Courts, both before and since the

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. 68, par. 367.



Reformation, was far more concerned with such matters as are now dealt with by the Probate and Divorce Division of the High Court of Justice, with tithe and church rates, with the correction of the laity for immorality and irregularity, than with anything directly concerning the faith or worship of the Church. As to the Courts themselves, the Courts of the Archdeacon, of the Bishop, and of the Metropolitan, have been from time immemorial substantially what they are now ; and there has always been the right of appeal in due gradation from the one to the other. Controversy begins when we come to consider what provision has been made for further appeal, and becomes acute upon the question whether and how such appeal ought to be given. There is no doubt that before the Reformation the normal course of ecclesiastical litigation included appeal to Rome. Whether or not such an appeal was permitted, and whether or not, if permitted, it was in practice used, in cases of doctrine or ritual, are points which cannot be said to be altogether settled. It is probably enough for the present purpose to say that such appeals were at least so rare that so eminent an authority as the late Bishop Stubbs was not satisfied of their existence. In his opinion: 'There is no evidence to shew that before the Reformation appeal was allowed in suits for correction on points of doctrine or ritual, and although there may be instances of prosecution for heresy being instituted on the demand of the Pope, there is no instance of appeal to the Pope on a charge of heresy being allowed by the provincial courts.'<sup>1</sup> The Commission of 1881 so far adopted the Bishop's conclusions as to declare that appeals to Rome 'gradually in fact became restricted to testamentary and matrimonial business.'<sup>2</sup> When in the days of Henry VIII. the Church and realm of England rejected the authority of the Pope, the question immediately presented itself whether any, and if so what, substitute should be introduced for the appellate jurisdiction which the Pope had exercised over the English Ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> Historical Appendix to *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts*, 1883, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> Report (1883), p. xix.

Courts; and this involved the further question whether, if a new appellate tribunal were set up, it should entertain appeals in all cases, or in such only as had theretofore been taken to Rome. What Parliament in fact did was as follows. In 1533, by the Statute of Appeals (24 Hen. 8, c. 12), appeals to Rome in 'causes testamentary, causes of matrimony and divorces, rights of tithes, oblations and obventions' were forbidden, and such matters were thenceforth to be determined within the realm, the Archbishops' Courts being the final spiritual courts except in cases touching the Crown, in which a further appeal to the Upper House of Convocation was provided. In the following year (1534) the Statute of Submission of the Clergy (25 Hen. 8, c. 19) was passed, which prohibits all appeals to Rome, whether in the cases enumerated in the Statute of Appeals or otherwise, and applies the system of appeals provided by the statute for ordinary cases to all ecclesiastical cases whatsoever, including (as has been decided) those which touch the Crown. If the Act had stopped there, the Court of the Province would have been the final court, as it was under the Statute of Appeals in all cases within that Statute in which the Crown was not concerned. But the Statute of Submission added these momentous words, from which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a court of ecclesiastical appeal deduces its title:

'And for lack of justice at or in any the courts of the archbishops of this realm . . . it shall be lawful to the parties grieved to appeal to the King's Majesty in the King's Court of Chancery, and that upon every such appeal a Commission shall be directed under the great seal to such persons as shall be named by the King's Highness his heirs or successors, like as in case of appeal from the Admiral Court, to hear and definitively determine such appeals and the causes concerning the same; which Commissioners so by the King's Highness his heirs or successors to be named or appointed shall have full power and authority to hear and definitively determine every such appeal with the causes and all circumstances concerning the same; and that such judgement and sentence as the said Commissioners shall make and decree in and upon any such appeal shall be good and



effectual and also definitive and no further appeal to be had or made from the said Commissioners for the same.'

The words of Bishop Stubbs as to this enactment are of importance :

' In the Statute 25 Hen. 8, c. 19 no express mention is made of appeals in questions of doctrine and ritual, so as to give a new right of appeal on such points where it had not before existed ; as there was no custom of appealing on such points to the Pope, it is improbable that by this Act it was intended to allow an appeal on them to the King in Chancery, *i.e.* to the Court of Delegates ; and as in the same session of Parliament an Act ' [25 Hen. 8, c. 14, confirming 2 Hen. 5, st. 1 c. 7] ' was passed for the repression of heresy by other means, in which no provision for appeal of any kind is made, it is improbable that it was ever intended to apply the process before the High Court of Delegates to such questions.'

The tribunal constituted anew for the hearing of each appeal, as provided by the Statute of Submission, came to be known as the Court of Delegates, and was a final tribunal of ecclesiastical appeal down to 1832. During the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., the Court of High Commission absorbed practically all jurisdiction in cases really ecclesiastical. This probably explains the fact that when that Court was abolished it was assumed that appeal lay to the Delegates in all ecclesiastical cases, the distinction between the different classes of ecclesiastical business, for which different provision had been made by the legislation of Henry VIII., being forgotten.

The Court of Delegates was in some respects an unsatisfactory tribunal, and it was for very many years before it was abolished the subject of complaints. These complaints (which were considered by the Royal Commission of 1831 on Ecclesiastical Courts to be well founded) had relation to what formed the great bulk of the business which came before the Delegates—namely, matrimonial and testamentary cases—and had nothing to do with ecclesiastical cases in the sense in which the term is now used. The fact is that appeals really touching doctrine or worship are scarcely to

be found among the records of the Court of Delegates. As the result of a special report made at the instance of Lord Brougham by the Royal Commission in 1831, the jurisdiction of the Delegates was by the Act 2 & 3 Gul. 4, c. 92, transferred to the Privy Council, and became by an Act of the succeeding year (3 & 4 Gul. 4, c. 41) vested in the Judicial Committee of that body. It will be remembered that at the time at which these changes were effected the Convocations of the Church were not allowed to meet for business.

The objection taken by churchmen to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Privy Council has developed gradually, and the history of its development is sketched in the very interesting evidence of the Archbishop of Canterbury before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. The Archbishop establishes, we think, that in the first stage of the discussion the objections were confined to cases of doctrine; that when litigation on ritual and ceremonial began many of the 'High Church party' at first welcomed the Privy Council as a court of unbiassed lawyers whose decisions were to be preferred to those of the more prejudiced ecclesiastical judges; and that it was not until the judgements on vestments were pronounced that it became general to deny altogether for ecclesiastical cases of every description the appellate jurisdiction of the Privy Council. Human affairs are not governed by deductions accurately drawn from abstract propositions, and it is, we think, beyond question that in fact the growth of the belief (to the strength and prevalence of which the Archbishop emphatically testifies) that it is the duty of churchmen to refuse absolutely all obedience to the ecclesiastical decisions of the Privy Council, even in cases not directly involving doctrine, was immensely quickened when that tribunal decided, in apparent violation of every received principle of construction, that the 'Ornaments Rubric' prescribes the use, not of the ornaments which it mentions, but of such only of them as were ordered by another document, not referred to in the rubric, and issued about a century before. Had the decisions of the Privy Council upon the question of vestments been less hard to reconcile either with law or common



sense, certainly very much less would have been heard of the conscientious objection to its jurisdiction in ritual cases. It does not of course follow that the objection is unsound. As the Archbishop very candidly observes, 'it is based upon something deeper, further reaching, and more a matter of stern principle than any mere incident as to which way a decision has been recently given which might or might not affect those particular people.'<sup>1</sup> In other words, it does not follow, even if the examination into the title of the tribunal was originally caused by the character of its decisions, that the adverse conclusion upon that title is erroneous.

We think that the history, the main course of which we have briefly traced, establishes the position of those who affirm that the law of the Church of England is to-day in fact determined, so far as it is formally determined at all, by judges who represent not the Church but the State, set up by the State without consulting the Church, and neither possessing nor claiming to possess any spiritual or ecclesiastical authority. We know of no Christian body outside the Church of England which would be content to rely for the interpretation of its laws upon a tribunal so constituted. Its position is, we believe, wholly inconsistent with the tradition of the Universal Church, and with the theory of the English Constitution.

Two points occur here which were the subject of many questions and answers before the Royal Commission. It is said that the Privy Council do not determine the law of the Church, but merely interpret the instruments by which it is determined. Again, it is said that whatever force the objection to the Privy Council might have if it were confined to its jurisdiction in things spiritual, yet, when rights of property and other temporal matters are concerned, it is impossible to escape the control of secular law and secular courts.

With regard to the first of these points, it represents a position hardly tenable by anyone who knows anything of English legal procedure. Under a system such as ours, in

<sup>1</sup> *Minutes of Evidence*, vol. ii. p. 370.

which the decisions of the judges are of authority for the determination of other cases, the enactment of a statute is in reality but the first stage in the making of the law on the matter dealt with. The next stage is the interpretation by the Courts of the words used by the legislature, and the law consists, not of the bare statute but of the statute with the glosses put upon it by the judges. The older the statute the more copious is, as a rule, the authoritative commentary, and moreover the older statutes, and such documents as the rubrics of the Prayer Book, are not usually expressed with the precision at which modern draftsmen at least aim; are thus in more need of interpretation, and leave to the office of the interpreter greater freedom and therefore greater power. In other words, a tribunal duly authorized to interpret such documents as the formularies of the Church is in fact not merely the expounder, but in great degree the maker, of the Church's law. Moreover its power is the greater because its decisions are practically exempt from correction by fresh legislation.

But in truth it is unnecessary to labour the contention that such a tribunal as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council must inevitably (so far as it has authority at all) determine the law of the Church. We have an express declaration by the tribunal itself that this is its function. In the year 1882 the appeal of *Merriman v. Williams*<sup>1</sup> was heard and determined by the Privy Council. The appeal arose in a suit brought by the Bishop of Grahamstown in the secular courts of the Cape Colony in order, among other objects, to restrain Dr. Williams, who was dean and rector of the cathedral church of St. George, Grahamstown, from officiating in that church. The ground of the suit was (in substance) that Dr. Williams, being a member of the Church of the Province of South Africa and subject to its discipline, had been suspended from his office by a sentence of the Diocesan Court duly pronounced. The church in question was held in trust exclusively 'for ecclesiastical purposes in connexion with the Church of England' as by law established; and the defence set up by

<sup>1</sup> *Law Reports*, App. Cas. vol. vii. p. 484.



Dr. Williams was that it, and he as its minister, were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop or to the discipline of the Church of South Africa. So far as Dr. Williams' personal position was concerned, both the Supreme Court of the Colony and the Privy Council decided against him, holding clearly that he had submitted himself to, and was bound by, the laws of the Church of South Africa. Accordingly before the Privy Council the case was narrowed to the single issue, whether or not under the trusts upon which the building in question was held—namely for ecclesiastical purposes in connexion with the Church of England—it was a part of the property, and subject to the laws, of the Church of South Africa. In the words of the Judgement (p. 507), 'What the charters of the endowment now in question require is connexion with the Church of England as by law established; and on this part of the case it is sufficient for the plaintiff if he can show such a connexion on the part of the Church of South Africa.' Now the written constitution of the Church of South Africa affirmed 'in the strongest way the connexion of the Church of South Africa with the Church of England, and its adherence to the faith and doctrine of the Church of England' (p. 509); but it contained a proviso which was, in the opinion of the Privy Council, fatal to the contention that the two Churches were 'connected':

'Provided also that in the interpretation of the aforesaid standards and formularies' [of the Church of England] 'the Church of this province be not held to be bound by decisions in questions of faith and doctrine, or in questions of discipline relating to faith and doctrine, other than those of its own ecclesiastical tribunals, or of such other tribunal as may be accepted by the Provincial Synod as a tribunal of appeal.'

The effect of this was, in the judgement of the Privy Council, substantially to exclude 'portions of the faith and doctrine of the Church of England' (p. 509). In order to make good this position, it was necessary for the Lords of the Council to decide where and how that faith and doctrine are to be discovered, and their conclusion is expressed in the

Judgement (delivered by the late Lord Hobhouse) with singular force and clearness :

The standards of faith and doctrine adopted by the Church of England 'are not to be found only in the texts. They are to be found also in the interpretation which those texts have from time to time received at the hands of the tribunals by law appointed to declare and administer the law of the Church' (p. 509) : 'The decisions referred to' (that is, the decisions of the Privy Council in the Gorham case and in the *Essays and Reviews* cases) 'form part of the constitution of the Church of England as by law established, and the Church and the tribunals which administer its laws are bound by them. That is not the case as regards the Church of South Africa. The decisions are no part of the constitution of that Church, but are expressly excluded from it. There is not the identity in standards of faith and doctrine which appears to their lordships necessary to establish the connexion required by the trusts on which the church of St. George is settled. There are different standards on important points. In England the standard is the formularies of the Church as judicially interpreted. In South Africa it is the formularies as they may be construed without the interpretation' (pp. 510-511).

We have thought it right to devote some space to an examination of this important decision, because it establishes conclusively that the Privy Council does in fact claim binding authority to determine not merely the ritual but also the faith, of the Church : an authority which in truth follows necessarily from its jurisdiction, if conceded, as the final tribunal of ecclesiastical appeal. We cannot, we confess, understand the position of anyone who believes that the Church is in any sense a spiritual society and at the same time regards such a jurisdiction as tolerable. We are glad to think that the Royal Commission do not defend it.

We pass now to the second point mentioned above : namely, that inasmuch as litigation in the Ecclesiastical Courts often, if not always, involves property, it is necessary to have an appeal from those courts to a secular tribunal. This point recurs perpetually throughout the proceedings of the Royal Commission, and we have been surprised to notice the confusion which appears to have beset the



minds not only of many witnesses but also of some of the Commissioners, with regard to it. In one sense the proposition is a truism. Nothing which affects the person or property of any subject is exempt from review by the King's courts. But there is no inconsistency with this in the finality of decisions of Ecclesiastical Courts, or of any other special tribunals, as to matters within their jurisdiction and duly determined by them. The most striking difference as to this between the courts of the 'established' Church of England and similar tribunals of 'voluntary' religious bodies is that the jurisdiction of the latter must be proved, as must the jurisdiction of arbitrators, commissioners, and other special secular tribunals, by shewing either agreement to be bound by their decisions or specific authority conferred on them by Parliament, whereas, on the other hand, the courts of the Church of England are of immemorial authority recognized by the Common Law. We ought perhaps to notice another distinction, the importance of which has become almost wholly theoretical : namely, that whereas the courts of the Church have jurisdiction in theory over all persons within the realm, the tribunals of other religious bodies have no power except over persons who in some way or other have been brought expressly under their authority. The fact that the coercive jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts is now practically confined to the clergy prevents this distinction from being of actual importance. But the principle upon which the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts are enforced by the State through the ordinary courts of law is exactly the same as that upon which are enforced those of the voluntary tribunals of Nonconformist bodies, or those of arbitrators and other similar tribunals, whether agreed upon by the parties concerned or imposed upon them by statute : namely, that within their powers they are supreme, and the King's court, if appealed to, has merely to inquire whether the matter decided on was within their jurisdiction, and whether the jurisdiction was regularly exercised. We will illustrate our meaning. Under the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act 1871, upon the vacancy of a benefice the amount payable in respect

of dilapidations by the outgoing incumbent or his representatives to the new incumbent is fixed absolutely, upon the surveyor's report (subject to the observance of certain forms and stages), by the bishop, without any possibility of appeal; and the sum so fixed is a debt due to the new incumbent and recoverable in an ordinary Common Law action. Let us suppose that the outgoing incumbent neglects to pay, and that his successor sues him at Common Law for the amount. The court could not entertain any suggestion that the valuation was incorrect, or that the bishop had made a mistake; it would merely require proof that the surveyor's report had been duly made, that the forms required by the statute had been observed, and that the bishop had made the order. On being satisfied of these facts, the court would be bound to give judgement for the amount claimed. This example shews clearly enough the confusion which we have mentioned as to the necessity of control by the King's courts. In our instance the control exists and is exercised, in the sense that the court sees that the special tribunal (in this case the bishop) has proceeded regularly in a matter within its authority; but there the control stops, and on the substance of the question, namely whether the order correctly represents what ought to be paid by one party to the other, the bishop is absolute master, and the court has nothing to say. It is obvious that the general principle of control by the King's courts over all transactions affecting person or property does not involve a right of appeal on merits.

Let us come a little nearer controversy. Witnesses before the Royal Commission who advocated what may be called a self-contained system of Ecclesiastical Courts, subject to no appeal to a secular tribunal, were repeatedly confounded by the suggestion that such an appeal is necessary because the sentences of Ecclesiastical Courts comprise suspension and deprivation, and thus touch property. As we have said, we are surprised that this line of cross-examination was so successful as it seems to have been; and the more because the very state of things which it is suggested is impossible, exists without inconvenience in Scot-



land, to say nothing of foreign countries. Let us see how it would work. Suppose a rector deprived by the sentence of the supreme ecclesiastical court, whatever it may be, for heresy. The vacancy is duly notified to the patron: he presents to the living, and his presentee is duly instituted and inducted; but the deprived rector refuses to leave the parsonage. Thereupon the new rector brings an action in the ordinary Common Law court to recover possession of the house. The court will require proof of the sentence of the ecclesiastical court and of the plaintiff's title as rector, and, these facts having been established, will give a judgement which will enable the sheriff to eject the deprived rector with whatever force may be necessary. No argument would be admissible as to whether the ecclesiastical court had decided rightly that the defendant was heretical, that being a matter exclusively for the ecclesiastical court and wholly outside the competence of the Common Law court. We have said that this system prevails in Scotland, and it is true that it does govern the relation of the Established Church of Scotland to the Court of Session. But it also prevails in England. Here, as in Scotland, the ordinary courts of law recognize fully the exclusive right of the Ecclesiastical Courts, proceeding regularly, to adjudicate upon matters within their jurisdiction. The difference is that in England the expression 'Ecclesiastical Courts' includes what is now admitted to be a secular court, representing not the Church but the State—namely, the Privy Council—whereas in Scotland the Ecclesiastical Courts are really ecclesiastical.

Both the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, appointed in 1881, and the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, recommend considerable changes in the ecclesiastical judicature, the more recent Commission having adopted, with one important modification, the conclusions of their predecessors on the subject. Both Commissions have been convinced that the maintenance of the existing system of courts as a working system is impossible. In the words of the Commission on Discipline:

'A Court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must,

above all others, rest on moral authority if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of the clergy, with strong lay support, refuse to recognise the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee, its judgments cannot practically be enforced.' <sup>1</sup>

We imagine that we are not wrong in concluding further that both Commissions, and more especially the later of the two, have considered that there is (to say the least) reason for the objections which have been taken to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Privy Council. It is, we think, much to have got so far, and we hope that such gross ignorance of the elementary conditions of the problem as was shewn even by so distinguished a witness as the present Attorney-General will become rarer in the future. If a solution is ever found, it will not be by legislation which disregards history and ignores the spiritual character of the Church.

We have said that the Report of 1883 and that of last year agree in the main in their proposals for the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts. These partly concern the Diocesan and Provincial Courts, all of which, in the judgement of the Commissioners, need to be strengthened. The alterations recommended are designed to secure the personal presence of the bishop and the metropolitan in their own Courts, and also the assistance of expert assessors. So far as we know, there is little difference of opinion either as to the expediency of reform, or as to the wisdom generally of these proposals. We pass to the far more controversial question of the final Court of Appeal. As to this the Commission of 1881 recommended as follows :

‘ An appeal shall lie from the Court of the Archbishop to the Crown, and the Crown shall appoint a permanent body of lay judges learned in the law, to whom such appeals shall be referred. Every person so appointed shall, before entering on his office, sign the following declaration : I do hereby solemnly declare that I am a member of the Church of England as by law established.

‘ The number summoned for each case shall not be less than five, who shall be summoned by the Lord Chancellor in rotation.

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. 67, par. 363.



‘The judges shall have the power of consulting the archbishop and bishops of the province, or, if thought advisable, of both provinces, in exactly the same form as the House of Lords now consults the judges of the land upon specific questions put to them for their opinion ; and

‘Shall be bound so to consult them on the demand of any one or more of their number present at the hearing of the appeal.

‘The judges shall not be bound to state reasons for their decisions, but if they do so, each judge shall deliver his judgement separately . . . and

‘The actual decree shall be alone of binding authority ; the reasoning of the written or oral judgement shall always be allowed to be reconsidered and disputed.’<sup>1</sup>

As we have said, the Commission on Discipline adopt these recommendations with one important modification. For the words of the earlier Report which would empower the judges of the final court to consult the bishops, they substitute the following :

‘Where, in an appeal before the Final Court which involves charges of heresy or breach of ritual, any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England shall be in controversy, which question is not in the opinion of the Court governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament, and involves the doctrine or use of the Church of England proper to be applied to the facts found by the Court, such question shall be referred to an assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, who shall be entitled to call in such advice as they may think fit ; and the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them shall be binding on the Court for the purposes of the said appeal.’<sup>2</sup>

Before we offer any criticism on these recommendations, it is important to see exactly what they mean. The appeal to the Crown from the Ecclesiastical Courts is retained ; it is an appeal in the ordinary sense : that is to say, the appellate court has power not merely to set aside the judgement of the lower court but (in substance) to determine the cause finally itself. The sole limit on its power

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. lvii.

<sup>2</sup> Report, p. 77.

is that on certain questions (but not all) which touch the doctrine or use of the Church, the court must consult the archbishop and bishops, and is bound by their opinion. We have said that it is only certain questions of doctrine and worship which are to be so referred, and consideration of those which are excepted will shew that the function intended to be reserved to the spirituality is very strictly limited. The synod (so to call it) is to have no voice if the question is '*in the opinion of the Court* governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament.' Reflecting that these words would include not only all the Acts of Uniformity but also the whole of the Prayer Book, and perhaps the Articles of Religion, we see that the power of the bishops, although introduced by the Commissioners with considerable parade, would scarcely exist as to ritual, and even as to doctrine would be narrowly circumscribed. On the other hand, it has been objected against this recommendation of the Commissioners, by those who view with jealousy anything which may tend to make the Church less comprehensive, that the form in which the Commissioners would commit to the bishops judgement on matters of doctrine, by requiring of them an abstract statement to be rigidly applied by the court, is far more dangerous to liberty of thought than a power to adjudicate directly upon the suit. We think that this criticism is well founded.

In order to understand the reasons for what is proposed it is necessary to see upon what principles the Commissioners base it. They say at p. 64 (par. 356) of their Report that the result of modern study of the nature and history of Ecclesiastical Courts has been

'a clearer perception of the functions which are appropriate to a Court exercising the Royal supremacy in ecclesiastical causes, whether it be the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council or any other tribunal.' 'It is recognised,' they add, 'that the authority exercised by this Court is that of the Crown and not that of the Church. Without being itself a Church Court, and without pretending to possess spiritual jurisdiction, it has the duty of revising, where necessary, judgments given in Church Courts

possessing spiritual jurisdiction. To quote the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission (1883): "Every subject of the Crown who feels aggrieved by a decision of any [spiritual Court] has an indefeasible right to approach the Throne itself with a representation that justice has not been done him, and with a claim for the full investigation of his cause." "

And they assume, as the consequence of the proposition thus quoted, that 'there must be an appeal to the Crown from the Church Courts.' We are confident that if the word 'appeal' is used here as meaning such an appeal as lies to the Privy Council at present, this is a *non sequitur*. What is this 'indefeasible right to approach the Throne itself' which is said to involve the necessity of an appeal from Ecclesiastical Courts to a secular court and the determination by a secular court of ecclesiastical causes? It is an imposing phrase. We have a vision of suppliant subjects kneeling before the monarch throned and crowned; and it is a little chilling to reflect that what is really meant by 'the Throne itself' is half a dozen lawyers sitting at a table and being 'approached' with a legal argument going to shew that on some doubtful point another lawyer has formed an erroneous opinion. We entertain, moreover, a good deal of suspicion as to an 'indefeasible right' of which the origin is a few words of a statute of Henry VIII., and without which our neighbours of the Established Church of Scotland contrive to get on perfectly well. The real truth is, we make bold to say, that this 'indefeasible right' (which is merely the familiar supremacy of the Crown over all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil) has nothing whatever to do with an appeal in the sense in which the Commissioners use the word. It does not mean that causes ecclesiastical and spiritual are to be determined by secular judges instead of, as Lord Coke says they are to be, by ecclesiastical judges. It means that the subject has a right to apply to secular judges, as representing the Crown, to keep the Ecclesiastical Courts from straying beyond their borders, to see that they do not do injustice, and to see that any of their judgements which the secular power is called upon to enforce has been regularly pronounced. This indeed is a conception



with which the lawyers and statesmen of Tudor times would be thoroughly familiar : we have already referred to the considerations which led Bishop Stubbs to believe that they never contemplated anything so foreign to the spirit of that age as an appeal (in the modern sense) to a secular court in causes really ecclesiastical.

We believe, therefore, ourselves that there is no constitutional principle which makes any such appeal necessary, and that it would be simpler and better to get rid of it altogether than by restrictions and qualifications to endeavour to avoid the difficulties which it involves. The abolition of the appeal would leave unimpaired the control which the High Court of Justice exercises over ecclesiastical courts by the ancient writs of mandamus and prohibition. The writs are ancient, but the control is living and effective. Not only can the Ecclesiastical Courts be thus compelled to do justice, and to keep within their jurisdiction, but they are also corrected if they misconstrue any Act of Parliament, even one which deals solely with ecclesiastical matters. We observe that Sir Lewis Dibdin in his evidence<sup>1</sup> belittles the writ of prohibition, and in particular that he omits to notice the important point just mentioned as to the interpretation of Acts of Parliament ; we have failed, moreover, to find that he mentions mandamus at all, although by that writ Ecclesiastical Courts can be compelled to do their duty, just as by prohibition they can be prevented from exceeding it. Sir Lewis throughout the inquiry cross-examined the witnesses with very remarkable knowledge and acumen, and although other eminent lawyers served on the Commission, they were not able to give the same time and attention to its proceedings, nor were they perhaps so well equipped for the purpose. The result was that, as Sir Lewis unfortunately could not cross-examine himself, his own evidence on matters of legal learning passed in great measure unchallenged.

Assuming that some appeal beyond the Provincial Courts is thought necessary, our conclusion, if we had power to do what we thought absolutely best, would be to provide

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* vol. 3, p. 403.

a final court truly ecclesiastical, composed of bishops representing the whole episcopate of the English provinces, assisted, as might be found necessary, by legal, theological, and liturgical experts as assessors. We believe that such a court would be an admirable one in actual working; we should be perfectly content to leave it without any control other than that which the State exercises, always has exercised, and always must exercise, by means of the ordinary courts of law; and we can see no need whatever for any further appeal. We may observe that the only tangible ground suggested by the Commissioners for a special appeal from Ecclesiastical Courts—namely, that ecclesiastical judges are appointed by bishops and not by the Crown—fails here, inasmuch as the bishops, who would compose the final court, are appointed by the Crown.

It is, however, most important to conciliate opposition, so far as it can be done without infringing the principles which must be regarded in any settlement which is to be final; and there is undoubtedly a strong prejudice for the control of Ecclesiastical Courts by a secular tribunal other than the ordinary courts of law. If this sentiment can be satisfied without violating principle, we think that it would be wise to satisfy it. Now, we take it that the fundamental and undisputed principles governing this matter are: first, that the Church judges ecclesiastical causes by the bishops or their delegates; and, second, that the State has a right to see that injustice is not done, nor justice denied, by the ecclesiastical judges to any of its subjects. We believe, as we have said, that the State can secure this latter object by means of its ordinary tribunals, but there is clearly no objection of principle to the erection of a special court for the purpose. What we believe to be essential is that such a court should not usurp the function of the Church courts—should not, that is, itself determine ecclesiastical causes, but should confine itself to correcting miscarriages on the part of the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is important to recall the language by which the Statute of Submission gave the appeal to the Delegates, and to contrast it with that in which appeal is permitted by the

Statute of Appeals from one Ecclesiastical Court to another. The Statute of Appeals (which is referred to and adopted by the Statute of Submission) allows the subject to 'take, have, and use his appeal' to the bishop, &c., 'if in case any of the parties be grieved.' In the Statute of Submission the words are 'for lack of justice at or in any the courts of the archbishops.' This language bears a strong likeness to, and was probably taken from, the well-known passage in the Constitutions of Clarendon: 'De appellationibus si emeruerint ab archidiacono debent procedere ad episcopum, ab episcopo ad archiepiscopum. Et si archiepiscopus *defecerit in iustitia exhibenda*, ad dominum regem perveniendum est postremo.' Here, again, we may note the difference between the language as to appeal from one Ecclesiastical Court to another, and that as to the final appeal to the king. It seems reasonable to conclude that the difference is significant, and that what is meant by an appeal 'for lack of justice' is not that the appellate Court is to examine the whole cause afresh, and to reverse the judgement of the court below merely because it does not agree with it, but that it is to correct anything which may fairly be called injustice. If, for example, the Ecclesiastical Court has admitted considerations wholly irrelevant or illegitimate, or has excluded or overlooked considerations plainly material, or if its judgement is in any other respect palpably mistaken or perverse, there would be a case for the intervention of the appellate court 'for lack of justice.' But it is, as we have said, essential, if the principle that the Church is the judge of her own law is to be maintained in truth and not merely in form, that the powers of the secular court of appeal should only be to remit for rehearing, and that it should not itself determine the cause, or merely remit it *pro forma* with a binding direction as to the judgement to be entered. We remind our readers of the words of that great ecclesiastical lawyer and judge, Sir Robert Phillimore, in his reservation appended to the Report of 1883:

'I am unable to concur in those recommendations of the Report which suggest that there should be an appeal to the



Crown: in other words, that lay judges should decide causes in the last resort, the practical effect of which would be to enable these lay judges to dictate to the archbishop spiritual sentences which he would have, perhaps contrary to his own judgement, to pronounce.' <sup>1</sup>

We are convinced that the final appeal recommended by the Commissioners would be open to the same objections on grounds of principle as that which is now authorized. If so, it would be far better to leave the whole thing alone than to legislate so. There are two grounds, and two only, which justify an alteration of the existing law in the direction recommended by the Commission: either that it is an unconstitutional infringement of the Church's right, or that it is thought by so many to be so that in practice it cannot be worked. If neither of these reasons be admitted, there is no ground for any change, and the law as it exists should be rigorously enforced. But it is worse than useless to devise a reform which is justifiable only on the assumption that it is right or necessary to satisfy certain convictions, if, after all, it does not satisfy them.

The appeal which we have suggested from the final Ecclesiastical Court, whether it be the Provincial Court or a Court representing both provinces, to a secular court of appeal, would be of the kind which is known in France as the *appel comme d'abus*, and is in use also in various forms in other countries. The essence of it is that it is a complaint to the secular power of abuse or injustice, and that, if it be made good, the result is that the cause is reheard before an Ecclesiastical Court, the cardinal principle that secular courts have no jurisdiction to decide ecclesiastical causes being preserved. We notice that Mr. Justice Phillimore, in his evidence before the Royal Commission (Q. 3583), gives it as his opinion that by the expression 'for lack of justice' in the Statute of Submission an appeal of this kind was intended. We find it difficult to reconcile this opinion with that part of the statute which empowers the Delegates 'to hear and definitively determine such

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. lxiii. We apprehend that in this passage by 'lay judges' are meant judges appointed by the Crown.

appeals and the causes concerning the same.' But, however this may be, it is satisfactory to find a precedent for the scheme of judicature which we have advocated, and to find it in a country which affords, in Dean Church's words, 'a remarkable example of a national Church, aiming at a constitutional position as a Divinely founded religious society, with its own usages and liberties, in harmony with . . . the claims of a singularly strong and jealous civil government.'<sup>1</sup>

It will have been noticed that the recommendations of the Commission of 1881 as to the final court include one that 'the judges shall not be bound to state reasons for their decision.' The Commission on Discipline also appears to attach importance to this point, and it seems to be thought that if judgement were given without reasons by the secular court of appeal (which was the practice of the Court of Delegates), the objections to the decision by such a court of ecclesiastical causes would disappear or be much diminished. We think it quite likely that if originally the Privy Council had imitated the Delegates in this respect, a good deal of agitation might have been avoided; but that a return to the practice now would be attended by any considerable advantages we believe to be a delusion. This is another of the points upon which the Commissioners appear to have accepted without much inquiry what Sir Lewis Dibdin told them. We observe that he went so far as to say (Q. 16264) that if reasons were not given 'there never could be any Privy Council judgements which would be precedents'; and to this he obtained the assent of so learned a person as Mr. Chadwyck-Healey. We can only say that it is simply not the fact that judgements of which the reasons are not reported are not treated as authorities in our Courts. Many instances will occur to every lawyer: we may mention the decisions of the House of Lords reported in the older reports; certificates by the Common Law courts upon cases submitted to them by the Court of Chancery; some decisions of the Court for Crown

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts*, 1883, Hist. App. vii. p. 170.

Cases Reserved ; and of the judges on Crown cases before that Court was established. But a moment's consideration will shew that it must be so. Suppose, for instance, a proceeding against a clergyman for wearing a chasuble : the Ecclesiastical Court decides in his favour ; the Privy Council, on appeal, reverse the decision. It is obviously a necessary element in the decision of the Privy Council that a chasuble is an unlawful vestment, and equally obvious that the decision would be relied on as an authority to that effect. Indeed, the words of the Commission of 1881, 'the actual decree shall be alone of binding authority,' admit as much.

There are many other points of great interest in connexion with Ecclesiastical Courts which are suggested by the Report and evidence under consideration ; but we can only deal, in conclusion, with two questions of what may be called practical politics.

It is usually objected, when opinions such as we have been contending for are put forward, that they involve a complete capitulation to the 'High Church party,' and that no corresponding concession is offered to other sections of the Church. We find, for instance, that this was put by some of the Commissioners to Lord Hugh Cecil. The best answer will be found, we think, in the words of the Report (p. 67, par. 363) :

'Those who most desire to repress irregularities are those who have most to gain by the substitution of an effective tribunal for a Court which, because it is powerless, encourages rather than represses disorder. The establishment of a Court, the authority of which could not be disputed, would destroy any foundation for the claim now in fact made by a section of the clergy to decide for themselves the limits of canonical obedience.'

This is, to anyone who will look at the facts, the most manifest truth. The case of such bodies as the Church Association is that law-breaking is widespread on the 'High Church' side. It is strange that it does not occur to them that it is breakers of the law who profit by the anarchy which results from attempting to work an impossible system. Again, the small extremist minority are pro-



tected against discipline, as things now are, by the support of an immensely larger body of churchmen, who, though they have little sympathy either with their teaching or their practice, are resolved to resist, even at the cost of the toleration of things which ought not to be tolerated, the exercise of a jurisdiction which they believe to be a violation of the fundamental liberties of the Church. For the attack the elementary tactics are to dissolve this alliance, and it is nothing else than folly for the 'Low Church party' to insist on retaining Courts which experience has shewn to be practically useless, because they are afraid of making concessions to 'High Church' principles. It is no doubt sometimes hinted, rather than stated, that this 'Low Church party' have, on their side, principles as to Church courts against which even such proposals as those of the Royal Commission would offend. We cannot think that this position can be seriously maintained. Indeed, we find it difficult to believe that there is, among churchmen of any school who have given thought to the matter, any considerable number who would deliberately defend the jurisdiction of a secular court to determine ecclesiastical causes. But whether this be so or not, it is at least incredible that any churchman could have a 'conscientious objection' to a court composed of bishops or their delegates. He might, of course, think it a court injudiciously constituted; but that is quite another matter. It seems to us, therefore, as to the Commission, that the 'Low Church party' have everything to gain, and nothing to lose, by the substitution of a correct procedure for one which, because it is incorrect, cannot be worked.

The other question is, we think, a more serious one, and it naturally and rightly troubled the minds of the Commissioners. When they were told that it was necessary to alter this and that in order to meet scruples by which the clergy were prevented from obeying existing authority, the question naturally occurred: What security have you that if what you suggest is done, obedience will follow? There is no doubt, we think, that this attitude of suspicion is not without justification. We are obliged

to say, further, that the way in which some of the witnesses gave their evidence was not likely to reassure the Commissioners. Nevertheless, the evidence, as a whole, confirms us in the clear conviction that if a genuine system of Ecclesiastical Courts were established, resting throughout upon the spiritual authority of the bishops, and subject only to such control by the secular power as is described above, and as has always been recognized by the Church as admissible, disobedience on the 'High Church' side would cease. We do not mean, of course, that all the decisions of such tribunals would necessarily be accepted, because it is conceivable that they might disallow doctrines or practices which some might regard as essential parts of the tradition of the Catholic Church; but the consequence would be that a person holding such opinions would, if condemned, feel himself constrained to cease to minister in a Church which had, in his view, abandoned the truth: he could not, as he does now, simply disregard the judgment of the court on the ground that it is the utterance not of the Church of which he is a priest but of the State, to which in such matters he owes no obedience.

We should like to add that we do not dissent from that which we understand to be the opinion of the Royal Commission, that it might be dangerous to set up an efficient system of Church courts without at the same time making more elastic the existing law of ritual and ceremonial.

---

## ART. II.—NEW COLLEGE AND KING'S: A STUDY IN REFORM.

1. *Augustus Austen Leigh, Provost of King's College, Cambridge.* A Record of College Reform. By WILLIAM AUSTEN LEIGH, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. (London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1906.)
2. *New College, 1856–1906.* By HEREFORD B. GEORGE, M.A., Senior Fellow. (London: Henry Frowde, 1906.)

THE present age has been lately described as an age of retrospect and stocktaking; and certainly the two books

at the head of this article seem to correspond with the general character thus assigned to the times. Roughly speaking, we may describe the years from 1830 to 1890 as a period of achievement—achievement which received its original impulse from the passing of the Reform Act of 1832. Since 1890, though useful reforms have been effected, we have been, perhaps, more engaged in reviewing, systematizing, and taking stock of the past than in entering on new and far-reaching enterprises. It looks as if with the advent to power of a vast and sweeping Liberal majority, such as was not equalled even in the days immediately succeeding the Reform Bill, we were to enter on a fresh stage of legislation and social reformation, or even revolution, the direction of which it is not easy to predict, but the general tendency of which is certain to be an attempt to secure for the working masses a larger share of those privileges and advantages which the reforms of the Victorian epoch mainly threw open to the middle classes.

Meanwhile, as we have said at the outset, the country has been busy in taking stock of what has been already accomplished, and in trying to realize what the gain and loss brought by the last sixty years have been. It is with one particular small field, within a much larger area at each of our old Universities, that the two books before us deal, shewing how in each case an ancient and important foundation has been so altered and transformed as to increase the utility of both, and to adapt them, as far as possible, to meet new needs and the requirements of an expanding and progressive age. We have spoken as if both books treated of the same subject—viz. the reforms effected in the great sister foundations of King's and New College: and so in substance they do; for though the first of the two works is in name a biography, and gives us some charming side glimpses into the life of the period, yet the kernel of the book and the main claim which justifies its publication lies in the story of the reforms effected by the subject of the biography and his contemporaries in the great foundation with which, first as Scholar, then as Tutor



and Dean, and finally as Provost, he was so long and so intimately associated.

The twin foundations of Eton and King's, owing their origin to the munificence of the unfortunate King Henry VI., had been confessedly modelled after the pattern of the two St. Mary Winton Colleges (New College and Winchester), founded some fifty years earlier by William of Wykeham. Indeed, the connexion between the two foundations had been even more intimate than this; for Henry, acting on the advice of Bishop Beckington, had imported his first Master, William of Waynflete, and his original Scholars direct from Winchester, so that Eton must be regarded as a veritable offshoot of the older school. In an interesting document, originally drawn up in 1444 and recently republished (its republication being celebrated by a gathering representative of the four colleges), the four foundations, 'recognizing themselves as animated by a common purpose and designed to serve a common end,' bound themselves by a solemn compact to assist one another and to promote each other's interests in all lawful ways. It is not surprising that, while the two schools, owing to the diversity of their particular circumstances, developed on somewhat different lines, the colleges which they were severally intended to feed and support should, as their circumstances were more alike, have had a very similar history. Briefly their history was of the following kind. In their earlier period both colleges, and notably King's, produced a number of distinguished scholars; but as time went on this became less and less the case, till, though in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century both colleges can point to a few distinguished names among their *alumni*, yet at this time the mass of the Fellows were neither diligent nor distinguished, but tended to sink more and more into a condition of easy-going and self-indulgent idleness. Nor is the explanation of this far to seek. In the first place, William of Wykeham—and in this he was followed by King Henry VI.—had, for some reason not very easy to understand, withdrawn his Fellows and Scholars from competing for the ordinary University degree. The members of both founda-

tions were for many centuries exempted from entering the Schools of the University, and received from their own College authorities the certificate which entitled them to a degree. It has been suggested that Wykeham's reason for making this curious provision was that he hoped to secure among his own Fellows, through the agency of their College examination and exercises, a higher standard of attainment than could be exacted in the University at large. If this were really his intention, his expectations were sadly disappointed. Cut off from the main stream of University life, removed from the healthy competition with other men, the majority of the Scholars of both colleges languished and grew idle, till as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century Laud could raise the query, 'How is it that Scholars come from Winchester so good and leave New College so bad?'—a result which the Archbishop attributed to the premature study of the *Institutes* of Calvin, but one which admitted, perhaps, of other explanations.

Then, again, the close and in course of time the ever more exclusive connexion which existed between the two colleges and the schools which respectively fed them, acted prejudicially upon both the colleges. In its origin the plan might have seemed well devised and likely to secure its object. At a time when the supply of young men fitted to profit by a University education was scanty, or at the best uncertain, it might well seem a reasonable step to train up in a good school, under good traditions and with a satisfactory curriculum, a body of youths qualified to profit by the further education which they would subsequently receive. In this way Wykeham hoped—and Henry VI. endorsed his hope—that he would be able to secure a body of Fellows well fitted to serve God in Church and State, a good supply of educated and learned clergy who should enrich the life of the English Church. But the mixing throughout earlier life with the same set of companions had a cramping and narrowing effect, and those who were not likely to succeed to a Fellowship—itsself often granted on the ground of being Founder's kin—drifted

off elsewhere, and found in other and wider fields the incentive and stimulus which residence at King's or New College too often failed to convey. The result was that, on the one hand, distinguished Etonians and Wykehamists—and there were always plenty of these—were to be found most often anywhere else than in the academic homes which the founders of these schools had provided for them; while, on the other, the numbers at the colleges shrank from generation to generation, till at last the members of the two foundations were almost restricted to those who either had Fellowships or were certain of succeeding to them.

Then, thirdly, those who were in this apparently enviable position found themselves, when they attained to it, deprived of every incentive and stimulus to exertion. They were in that happy or unfortunate position so tersely described in the well-known epigram on an undistinguished Fellow of Winchester College :

Quid petat ulterius? Nimis huic, Fortuna, dedisti,  
Cui satis est quod edat, cui nihil est quod agat.

And this was the position which the successful Fellow saw assured to him, not only while he lived at the University but also for life; for either he remained unmarried and kept his Fellowship all his days, in which case he had at least a competence assured to him as a bachelor; or, if he wished to marry, he waited till a college living fell to his turn, and then as far as possible things were made comfortable for him, to induce him to retire and create the vacancy to which some one else was anxious to succeed. Such a system could but lead to one result—the creation of an indolent, self-indulgent set of Fellows: and yet, as we shall see in the sequel, one not incapable of better things.

The general lines which reform followed at each of the two colleges were remarkably similar, in many respects even identical. Thus we observe that the first two steps taken at each foundation—both taken at a period earlier than that covered by the two books before us, earlier, therefore, than



the first University Commissions—were the voluntary surrender, at King's under the influence of Provost Oakes, at New College under that of Warden Shuttleworth, of the right to take a University degree without public examination ; and, secondly, the opening of scholarships at the respective schools connected with them to public competition. These two steps combined made at least a stirring of intellectual life at both colleges : a better stamp of Scholars was at once introduced, and these, when they went to Oxford or Cambridge, had the healthy stimulus which comes from finding oneself in keen competition with other men. Mr. Augustus Leigh, it is interesting to observe, was one of the early Scholars elected on the foundation at Eton under the new competitive system, while Mr. George was among the last set of boys who owed their election at Winchester to the old system of nomination. A further step in the direction of reform (taken at New College by the advice of the Visitor before the 1854 Commission, but only carried out at King's at a considerably later date) was the admission of Commoners side by side with the Scholars. But this change had for a long time very little effect in practice, as either no Commoners, or very few, presented themselves for admission ; and of those presenting themselves many in the earlier years were rejected, since the reforming Fellows determined that none but men willing to read for Honours, and to some extent capable of doing so, should be admitted. It was consequently fully ten years after the date of the first Commission before the numbers of Commoners perceptibly began to grow ; but after that time commenced that steady increase in numbers which, continuing during thirty years, has brought New College to the position of being the largest, or nearly the largest, college in Oxford—a position which has come to it in spite of the fact that the restriction that all its members must read for Honours in some final School is, with trifling exceptions, still maintained.

The next considerable step in the reform of the two colleges was the result of the University Commission of 1854. The new statutes (or *Ordinances*, as they were styled), which came into operation at New College in 1859

and at King's in 1861, set on a new footing the relations of the two colleges with Winchester and Eton respectively. While the general tendency of the changes inaugurated by the Commission at either University was to remove all local restrictions, privileges of special schools and of Founders' kin, and to throw all scholarships open to unrestricted competition, the Commissioners had shrunk, after some hesitation, from interfering with the century-long connexion which had subsisted between the two colleges and the schools which their founders had associated with them. New College was still to keep its Winchester, King's its Eton scholarships: only in each case the privileges of Founders' kin were abolished. Scholarships which the school could not adequately fill were to be thrown open to competition, and a certain number of open scholarships were to be established side by side with the school scholarships of either foundation. The object of the arrangement—and in both cases it succeeded in effecting its purpose—was that the school scholarships should not fall below the level of the open ones. There was, however, this difference in the two cases: that at New College the number of Winchester scholarships was fixed at six in each year, and their tenure limited to five years, whereas at King's the number was left indefinite, the scholarships, both Eton and open, being provided for by the gradual suppression of Fellowships from time to time, as they successively became vacant. The number of Fellowships was in this way to be gradually reduced from seventy to forty-six, and the number of Eton scholarships raised up to twenty-four in all, with ultimately a similar number of open scholarships. How soon, however, this change was to be carried out became for a time a standing matter of dispute. A further complication arose in this way. The senior Fellows had at King's a customary right to a larger dividend as compared with the juniors. It was not quite clear how far this right was an absolute one, nor even what was the precise way in which the dividend was to be calculated. The authority of the Visitor was invoked to settle the matter, and he gave a decision regarded by many of the

junior Fellows as unduly favourable to vested interests. It was rendered all the more onerous by the unfortunate assumption that the prosperity which the College was enjoying at the time when the decision was made would always continue, whereas, in fact, the period of agricultural depression set in very shortly after. Thus it proved in its entirety unworkable, and a compromise had to be effected by which, with a single exception, the seniors refrained from pressing for the full rights which were secured to them under the Visitor's award, and so left sufficient margin for the introduction and working of the new system and for the carrying on of the College under new conditions and on the new lines.

In the negotiations thus happily concluded Augustus Austen Leigh bore a beneficent and prominent, though not always the leading, part. But for the gradual introduction of the new system with a view to, and in defence of which the financial battle was mainly fought, he was almost entirely responsible, only receiving from time to time welcome help and encouragement from his friend and colleague, Henry Bradshaw, the well-known librarian of the Cambridge University Library. He was enabled to effect this in virtue of his position as Tutor, to which he was appointed early in 1868, while the battle about the finances was still raging. There is at Oxford nothing quite comparable to the office of Tutor in one of the smaller colleges at Cambridge. Functions which at Oxford are divided between the head of the college, the General College Meeting, the Tutorial Board or whole body of the Tutors, are at Cambridge concentrated in the hands of a single Tutor. Questions such as the admission of undergraduates, the entrance examination which they shall be required to pass, the general direction of their studies, the provision of lecturers to teach them, are left to a large extent to the Tutor's unaided discretion ; and were so left, perhaps, in an unusual degree to Augustus Leigh, in whose fair-mindedness, sagacity and shrewdness the younger Fellows, at any rate, placed almost implicit confidence. Owing to the exceptional position thus granted to him, the creation and



organization of the new staff of college lecturers and the general direction and distribution of the course of studies which the then gradually growing body of undergraduates were to follow, devolved directly upon him; and though he had to secure the consent of the College to the more important advances which he had successively to introduce, particularly to the erection of blocks of new buildings in which the increasing number of undergraduates could be housed, the consent and support of the College Meeting were in these years never, or scarcely ever, denied him. It was in this way that he succeeded in building up, at least in general outline, an efficient and satisfactory lecturing staff, and came to be regarded as the real founder of new King's. In addition to this he undertook during the same years the office of Dean, to which at King's the care of the chapel services and the choir are mainly entrusted. Here, too, he introduced many useful reforms, and it was under his guiding hands that the services of the noble chapel assumed that stately and reverent character for which they have now been long renowned.

The same problems with which he had to deal had been solved with less friction and difficulty at New College at a somewhat earlier period. The financial difficulties, owing to the presence and pressure of vested interests, which loomed so large at King's, were much less felt in the sister foundation. This was due partly to the fact that the seniors did not possess the same privileged position as at King's, partly to their not unduly insisting on, or pressing, rights which perhaps they had. The resources, also, of the college, carefully husbanded as they were by two Bursars of exceptional ability, proved adequate to meet the needs both of the older and the newer system. As to the Tutorial staff, again, not only did New College take over from its older phase a band of Tutors of exceptional force, ability, and wisdom, well fitted to launch it in its new career, but it secured in Mr. Alfred Robinson, almost the first elected of its new open Fellows, a man of supreme judgement and force of character, one of those rare personalities eminently fitted to found and build up a new

order of things on an old foundation. In its then Warden, too, Dr. Sewell, it had a head of open mind and loyalty of character, who, while bound by chains of strong attachment to the old order, was yet prepared to give the new a fair and impartial trial, and to accept and work to the best of his power every change which the College as a whole deliberately determined to adopt. Once again, all changes which might seem to further the efficiency of the college, though they had, of course, to be started by individual initiative, were introduced and discussed in the General College Meeting, and after the Ordinance—as the new statutes enacted by the Commission were called—was in working order, had to obtain a two-thirds majority, if they involved any departure from its provisions, before they could be submitted to the Privy Council for ratification. This provided, on the one hand, for ample discussion and consideration before the inauguration of any important change, but, on the other, secured to the College a wide liberty of action in cases where altered circumstances made the introduction of changes imperative or even very desirable. In a third particular New College was more fortunate than King's, in that it maintained much more fully than King's succeeded in doing, a real and vital connexion with the school with which their respective founders had associated each. Not only from the first were six Scholars elected annually from Winchester, if six Scholars good enough for the purpose could be found, but the old custom of making the election at Winchester was retained. The result has been that it is the normal ambition of a Winchester boy to 'get off' to New College, while New College itself has had a steady nucleus of good Winchester Scholars animated with affection for the college as the senior member of Wykeham's foundation, and anxious in every way to support its good name. With them the open Scholars, from time to time elected, have entered into friendly rivalry, in which the Winchester Scholars have certainly not had the worst of it, and both-alike have furnished an excellent intellectual centre to the college which has been both a stimulant and a steadying influence to the Commoners

who have gradually grown up around them. Between King's and Eton the connexion has been less close, mainly for two reasons. No fixed number of Scholars to be elected annually was under the new statutes assigned to Eton, and an Eton boy could never be sure, if he reached a sufficiently high position in the school, of going off to King's ; while the decision to which the Fellows came of holding the election at Cambridge rather than at Eton was, from the point of view of the connexion between the school and the college, an unfortunate one.

The years from 1868 to 1880 were a period of much reforming activity and zeal at both colleges. The two questions which, during those years, most occupied the minds of reformers at both universities, were the removal of the restriction of celibacy from holders of Fellowships, and the best mode of appointment to them, as also to the college offices for which Fellowships were in part a provision. In attempting to solve these two questions the two colleges took a somewhat leading part in their respective universities. Both questions arose, directly or indirectly, out of the action of the earlier Universities Commission. The general effects of the action of that Commission had been to make the work of teaching at the two universities a possible, and an actual, profession ; while the passing of the Universities Tests Act, in 1871, made it a profession which would be more and more thrown open to laymen. But in these circumstances it was natural, and indeed inevitable, that there should arise a demand that the restriction of celibacy, as the condition of continuing to hold a Fellowship, should be relaxed or abolished. So long as college teaching and college offices were mainly, if not exclusively, in the hands of clergymen, who would ultimately succeed to college livings, it was just a possibility (yet a possibility against which many chafed) that those engaged in college work would defer their marriage to such time as they could obtain a college living which would enable them to support a wife and possibly a family. But laymen had not this possibility before them ; and when they came to take a full part in college work, it was certain



that they would not be content either to remain single for an indefinite period or, if they married, to give up a large part of their income, and with it the privilege of remaining members of the Governing Body of the College. Various attempts were made to solve the problem, which certainly was not without its difficulties. If indiscriminate permission were given to all Fellows, when once elected, to marry, not only would the succession to Fellowships become unendurably slow, but a large part of the college revenues would be used to very little purpose in subsidizing people who had adopted professions away from the university—a clear waste of college endowments. But, on the other hand, how, it was asked, could a selection be made among men who had won their Fellowships exactly under the same conditions? The solution ultimately arrived at by New College, and afterwards by King's, was to give the College liberty to retain in its service and allow to marry such of its Fellows, being actually engaged in the work of the College, as it should seem to the College to be in its interest so to retain, and that for any term of years it might decide. This plan, while giving to no Fellow a right to marry and keep his Fellowship, did enable the College to retain in its service for so long as it desired teachers and other officers of proved value and experience. The other difficulty was that Fellows elected under a purely competitive system, such as that contemplated in the Ordinance, might have neither the inclination nor, perhaps, the capacity to fill a particular college post at the time when it happened to be vacant. A change in the New College Ordinance, assented to by Privy Council, empowered the College to elect without examination under special circumstances a man who might seem to the Fellows eminently qualified to fill a particular post in the College. The College made a limited number of elections under this amendment of the Ordinance to its own great advantage. King's took a further step in this direction by asking for and obtaining powers for the Governing Body, 'to extend the duration of the Fellowship in the case of persons eminent for learning or science, or of persons whose studies are likely to be of

material service in the promotion of any art or science.' One other movement endorsed and adopted by the subsequent Commission was, though not inaugurated very early, adopted by New College and also by King's, viz. the system of intercollegiate lectures, or rather of the interchange of lectures between different colleges and college tutors. This system, suggested in the first instance by the late Master of Balliol, took shape first in a proposal for an interchange of lectures between Balliol and New College; but it quickly spread to other colleges and was finally made by the new Commission universal at Oxford and in a less degree at Cambridge also.

The labours of the two University Commissions, appointed in 1877 and continued till 1879, occupy a somewhat prominent place in both the books under consideration. The Commissions were, however, mainly engaged in dealing with problems which had been thought of, and had obtained a partial solution, in each of the two colleges. In many respects the Commissioners accepted conclusions which had been already reached by the colleges themselves; in others they carried to their logical conclusion principles the colleges had accepted; while in a few particulars they imposed conditions which did not altogether approve themselves to the colleges concerned. The main matters dealt with by the Commissioners were three—the provision of a permanent and adequate teaching staff within the college itself; the emoluments and tenure of Fellowships and Scholarships; the contributions which Colleges might reasonably be expected to make to University purposes. On the first of these heads the Commission had to do little more than confirm and render permanent arrangements which had already been made. Dividing the Fellowships at New College into three classes, ordinary, tutorial, and professorial, they provided the second class with an additional endowment out of college funds, limited their maximum number to ten and constituted them the permanent element in the college staff. All tutorial Fellows were permitted to marry, provided that a sufficient number of Fellows were resident within the college walls to maintain order and

discipline. At Cambridge, where, as already noticed, the distinction between Tutor and Lecturer is greater than it is in Oxford, and the dignity of the Tutor is greater, the existing arrangements were on the whole confirmed; only at King's educational matters were to a great extent removed from the cognizance of the General College Meeting and placed in the hands of an Educational Committee. Mr. W. Austen Leigh states that this system has been found to work satisfactorily and assures us that it is one of the reforms to which his brother attached great importance; it may, however, be doubted whether there is not some advantage in the principles even of educational questions being decided by the General College Meeting, though the working out of details may have to be left to Committees. A certain amount of independent and outside criticism is thus secured which can scarcely fail to be a wholesome element.

The second point was the value and tenure of Scholarships and Fellowships. In the case of both colleges the value of scholarships was reduced, being fixed at a maximum of 80*l.* Their tenure was also reduced from five (or at King's even more) to four years. At Oxford scholarships had further to be renewed at the end of two years, the Tutor having to certify as a condition of renewal that the holder has been diligent and well conducted; while at King's the entrance scholarships were supplemented or replaced at the end of two years by college scholarships which were rewards for work done at Cambridge itself. The value of an ordinary Fellowship was fixed at New College at 200*l.* a year, while at King's it was to be 250*l.* or of such other value as the funds of the College permitted; as a matter of fact, Mr. Leigh tells us that it has not since the days of agricultural depression reached at any time quite 100*l.* The tenure was fixed at New College at seven years, with an extension to eight years in the case of those who had done work for the College or the University; at King's at six years, but it might rise in amount, as we have seen, to 250*l.* a year if the funds of the College permitted it. The restriction of celibacy as a condition of tenure was at both universities entirely removed.



But it was on the question of what contribution could fairly be expected and asked for from the College revenues to the University that the greatest difficulties arose. At New College something had already been done in this direction, as ever since the days of the Ordinance the College had contributed to the stipends of the two Savilian Professors (of Geometry and Astronomy); while at King's the matter had been discussed but no actual step had been taken. As one of the primary objects of the Commissions at both universities was to secure larger contributions from the Colleges for University purposes, it was certain that in neither case would matters be allowed to stand exactly where they were. The recommendations of the Commissioners of 1878 were based upon the figures of the Cleveland Commission which had inquired into and reported in 1873 on the revenue of the Universities and the Colleges. This Commission, conducting its inquiries in a period of unexampled agricultural prosperity, had estimated that the resources of the Colleges would remain at, or would even exceed, the high-water mark they had then touched. The event—as alas ! is too well known—has by no means justified their rosy anticipations. The consequence was that the subsequent Commission, basing its awards on these fallacious anticipations, imposed at both Universities burdens on the Colleges which they found themselves in many instances unable to sustain. New College, in addition to a moderate contribution to the Common University Fund, was to contribute to or support entirely five University Professors who, as they were successively constituted, were to become Fellows of the College. Two of them, the Savilian Professors, had been already taken on under the provisions of the earlier Ordinance; only they became now full Fellows of the College. Two others, the Wykeham Professorship of Logic and the Wykeham Professorship of Physics, have been in the years that have elapsed since the Commission the one wholly, the other almost completely, endowed. The condition of the funds of the College has not yet permitted the constitution of the fifth Professorship, the Wykeham Professorship of Ancient History. The two Wykeham



Professors, like the two Savilian, have been admitted Fellows of the College.

The burden imposed on King's was not so heavy. It paid its quota to the aggregate sum, estimated ultimately to amount to 30,000*l.* a year, which was to be contributed by the Colleges jointly for University purposes. Four Professorial Fellowships were in addition to be maintained by it out of its resources; only at Cambridge, differing in this respect from Oxford, the Colleges were left free to select to what Professorships these Fellowships should be attached. As the agricultural depression has pressed more heavily on Cambridge than on Oxford, the Cambridge colleges have been even further removed than those at Oxford from being able to contribute the full amount that was expected of them to the needs of the University.

The years which have elapsed since 1880 have been mainly spent in working out in practice the reforms which the 1877 Commission inaugurated. Such periods of comparative calm must inevitably follow epochs of change and energetic reform, if any good work is to be done. It is impossible to work any institution satisfactorily if it is to be undergoing perpetual change. Austen Leigh, first as Tutor and Dean, then as Provost, had the pleasure of seeing the various reforms, which he had taken so large a part in devising, come gradually into practice, and justify themselves in most instances by the touchstone of experience. At both colleges work still remained to be done, but it was work for the most part of a supplementary kind. Additional new buildings had in these years to be provided to meet the increasing number of undergraduates who continued to flock to them. Austen Leigh's first business almost as Provost was to superintend the erection of a new block which was put up near the Cam, from the designs of Mr. Bodley, while New College supplemented the stiff and heavy, if somewhat stately, pile designed by Sir Gilbert Scott, by the more ornamental buildings which Mr. Basil Champneys has in the last twenty years erected—the two being connected by the fine entrance tower, also designed by Mr. Champneys and erected as a memorial to Mr. Alfred

Robinson. At King's soon after the new statutes were passed we find Augustus Leigh, then Vice-Provost, drawing up a scheme for the better provision of college teaching. The scheme proposed by him was not carried out in its entirety, as the revenues of the College had in the years which followed its promulgation seriously diminished, but its main principles were adhered to and its author was able as Provost to assist and to superintend its working as well as that of many other features of college life for which in his earlier days he had been responsible. For, while at Cambridge it is inevitable that a large part of the time and energy of the Head of a House should be taken up in the management of University business, and the Provost of King's took a full share in such work and by his known fairness and his conciliatory disposition obtained the acceptance of many reforms which were advantageous to the University; yet with Austen Leigh the life and interests of his own College remained, after he had become Provost, his main passion as it had been before, and it was as Tutor, Dean and Provost of King's during the stirring days of its reconstruction, that he will be, and would have wished to be, chiefly remembered.

Next to the successful working of the new statutes, which had of course to be brought gradually into operation and for the successful working of which in their earlier years Mr. Alfred Robinson, who had been to so large an extent their author, was largely responsible, two subjects have in the last two decades mainly occupied the attention of the Fellows of New College. The first of these is the establishment on a satisfactory footing of a scheme of pensions which shall provide for those who during a long period of years have taken a full share in college work; the other has been the introduction of greater elasticity in the mode of electing to Fellowships, so as to secure, on the one hand, more ample opportunities for selecting younger men, if necessary without examination, who may be invited to take a part in college work; on the other hand, to be able to enroll among the Fellows men of ability who have already done good work or give promise of being able to do good



work, in the field of original research. Amendments to the statutes intended to further both these objects have recently received the assent of the Privy Council, and the College has availed itself partly of the powers given to it under the statutes of 1878, partly of the ampler liberties which it has since acquired, to add to the roll of its Fellows several men of distinction who have rendered valuable service to the University. It is interesting to note in this connexion that in addition to the four Professors who are attached to the College by the statutes, no fewer than five of its other Fellows are at the present time engaged in doing, either as professors, lecturers or demonstrators, what may properly be regarded as University as opposed to specifically College work.

We have thus traced how during a period of fifty years these two foundations, starting with similar objects, the later of them founded in conscious imitation of the older, have gradually transformed themselves, or been transformed, so as to serve wider uses than in the past and to accommodate themselves more fully to altered conditions on lines which, though not, of course, identical, are still parallel. In both cases the two books placed at the head of this article suffice to shew that the work of reform has been conscientiously and effectively done. Both colleges were fortunate in finding leaders competent to deal with the emergency they were called upon to face ; the leaders in both cases were backed by a majority of the Fellows who while recognizing the need for reform were anxious to retain and strengthen whatever was good and sound in the traditions of the past. At both colleges the old order has changed and given place to new : we trust and believe that both alike will find in that new order larger opportunities of usefulness, an increased sphere of influence, and a stronger hold upon the national life.

We cannot withhold a word of praise in conclusion as to the way in which the two authors have carried out the task which they respectively set themselves. Mr. George's monograph is a model of arrangement, clearness of statement, accuracy and tactful treatment. The tale

which he has unfolded will be found interesting and instructive by the general public, while it will be appreciated even more warmly by those who have a closer tie with the College which he has served so long and so faithfully. Mr. William Austen Leigh's larger work is as charming as a biography as it is faithful and accurate as an account of those College reforms with which his brother's name will always be so intimately associated. The pictures of family life at Scarlett's and Bray, of the father who in addition to serving his church so devotedly, brought up his sons with such diligence and watchfulness, of the school life in college at Eton in the late fifties, of the domestic happiness and liberal hospitality enjoyed and practised in the Provost's Lodgings at King's, linger in the memory, and will serve to hand down to posterity an aspect of life in the latter half of the nineteenth century which might otherwise not have found a chronicler: an aspect of which the present and the last generation will have no reason to be ashamed.

---

ART. III.—THE BENEDICTINE ABBEY OF  
WESTMINSTER.

1. *Missale ad usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, nunc primum typis mandatum curante JOHANNE WICKHAM LEGG. 'Henry Bradshaw Society.' (London : 1891, 1893, 1896.)
2. *Customary of the Benedictine Monasteries of Saint Augustine, Canterbury, and Saint Peter, Westminster.* Edited by Sir EDWARD MAUNDE THOMPSON, K.C.B. 'Henry Bradshaw Society.' (London : 1902, 1904.)
3. *Westminster Abbey, its Story and Associations.* By Mrs. A. MURRAY SMITH [E. T. BRADLEY]. (London : Cassell & Co, 1906.)
4. *Westminster Abbey and the Kings' Craftsmen : a Study of Mediæval Building.* By W. R. LETHABY. (London : Duckworth, 1906.)
5. *The Obituary Roll of John Islip, Abbot of Westminster, 1500-1532, with Notes on other English Obituary Rolls.* By W. H. ST. JOHN HOPE, Esq., M.A. 'Vetusta Monumenta.' (Westminster : Society of Antiquaries, 1906.)

OUR knowledge of the history of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster has hardly advanced since Richard Widmore wrote in 1751. Widmore was Librarian to the Dean and Chapter, and he did a priceless work in arranging and classifying their muniments, many of which would have been completely devoured by beetles or damp but for his timely care. The knowledge which he thus gained enabled him to write a succinct narrative of the history of the Abbey, in which his judgement and his accuracy are seldom at fault. In more recent times Mr. Burtt largely added to the detail of Widmore's skeleton catalogue, and published a certain amount of interesting material for the Historical Manuscripts Commission. At the present time Dr. Edward Scott, formerly Keeper of the Manuscripts at the British Museum, is engaged in the laborious task of describing every document, preserving so far as possible Widmore's original arrangement. Despair of coping with so vast and



multifarious a collection of materials is perhaps the cause why no advance of a serious kind has been made in the early history of the Abbey.

Stanley, indeed, has described inimitably the coronations and the funerals of our sovereigns, the monuments of the illustrious dead, the vicissitudes of a great national institution which has reflected every change in the nation's life. His *Memorials* can never be superseded : the beauty of their style, the skill of their arrangement, and the truth of the historical pictures which they present, have won for them a place in English literature. Much has been learned since he wrote, many of his statements must be corrected ; but Stanley had a genius for accumulating illustrative facts and employing them aptly in the reproduction of historical scenes ; the wealth of his information is amazing, and he always gives the authority for what he says. The student will value his book in proportion to the extent of his own research.

But Stanley had no kind of sympathy with the monks. Thanks to Widmore's labours, he was able to sketch the story of the Abbots in a few bright pages, and to trace the exemption from episcopal control which he probably counted their most precious legacy ; but he had neither taste nor capacity for the investigation of the confused treasures of the Muniment Room, which contain all the petty details out of which the life of the monastery must some day be laboriously reconstructed.

Stanley's *Memorials* were divided into compartments and classified according to subject-matter ; they did not profess to give a continuous history. It was accordingly possible for a good book to be written on other lines, telling the whole story in chronological sequence ; and this was skilfully accomplished by a daughter of the late Dean Bradley in a popular volume entitled *Annals of Westminster Abbey*. Gracefully written and unencumbered by notes, it serves, especially in its recent and more compact form, as an excellent introduction for the general reader ; but the student is perplexed when he finds much fresh information which he cannot easily trace to its original sources.

NGAT. VET. 7

A new kind of book has been given to us by Mr. W. R. Lethaby, who within a few days of its publication was called to the responsibility of succeeding his friend Mr. Micklethwaite as surveyor of the fabric which he had so long and so eagerly studied. Some years ago Mr. Lethaby began to grapple with the problem of the personality of the builders who constructed our great English churches. He was not to be satisfied with the commonplaces that 'they were built by the monks,' and that 'there were no architects in those days.' He remembered that the Abbey in particular had been built by kings: he picked out from fabric rolls and other documents preserved among state records the names of the master masons of successive kings, and he shewed that these men with the master carpenters must have the credit of the great design. In his new book he focusses the result of his inquiries. Three master masons, Henry of Westminster (1244-1253), John of Gloucester (1253-1262), Robert of Beverley (1262-1280), were in turn responsible for the rebuilding of the choir and transepts and the first bays of the nave, which King Henry III. ordered and paid for. The courage which could throw down Edward's magnificent choir was the King's; the genius and the skill which erected what we see to-day must be credited primarily to Henry the Mason, and in due measure to his gifted successors.

These names, indeed, are not quite new to us: they are to be found in Scott's *Gleanings*, and lurking in difficult documents printed by Willis or Burtt. But Mr. Lethaby has discovered the men who bore the names, and has made them live again in the pages of architectural history. He finds Henry of Westminster sent to plan fortifications at York Castle: John of Gloucester working at Woodstock, and designing a gate-way which still stands at Guildford; Robert of Beverley repairing Westminster Palace after a fire, and completing the Tower of London for King Edward III. He knows where his masons lived, and that John married Alice and Robert Cecily. Moreover, these three head a long list of master masons, master carpenters, sculptors, painters and other craftsmen, to the number of

three hundred or more: not all, indeed, engaged on the Abbey church or in the King's employ, but all worthy to be rescued from oblivion, if only to condemn our long neglect.

It is a natural result of these researches that much fresh material is available for fixing the exact dates of various portions of the fabric. In this important work Sir Gilbert Scott had led the way, and his conclusions were partially corrected, but largely confirmed, by the late Mr. Micklethwaite, of whom Mr. Lethaby speaks as 'an almost infallible authority on the Abbey.' It is satisfactory to be told after a full and independent examination of all the available material that 'there cannot be a doubt as to the correctness of the dates assigned to the different parts by Mr. Micklethwaite.'

Having irrefutably demonstrated the English nationality of our builders, Mr. Lethaby delights to shew that they placed themselves under the most progressive influences of their day, and imitated without reserve what was new and admirable in the great churches of France. The following dates are instructive:

'When Westminster was begun the choir of Reims had been consecrated four years; the Sainte Chapelle in Paris was well advanced, and it was consecrated in 1248; the nave of Amiens was finished, its vast choir was just being begun, and it was *completed* in the same year, 1269, in which Henry III.'s work at Westminster was consecrated. Beauvais, the mightiest choir of them all, was begun in 1247 and finished in 1271, thus exactly following Westminster at an interval of two years' (p. 116).

A more elaborate comparison than has hitherto been made results in the judgement that Reims, the coronation church of France, was primarily followed: 'our windows and radiating chapels we may speak of as *copies* of those at Reims'; the pillars and their bases are closely similar, though the four smaller shafts at Westminster are separated from the central column, because they are of English Purbeck. Moreover, 'at Reims, and at Westminster, the capitals of the piers were linked together with a system of iron ties passing across at the springing of the arches'; at



Reims the iron hooks only which held the bars remain ; this is so in certain parts of our church too, though elsewhere the bars of iron, and in some instances bars of wood, are as the builders left them. The Sainte Chapelle offers the pattern of the Chapter House windows, and also of some of the earliest tracery in the cloister. Our great north portal corresponds too closely in design with the west front of Amiens to allow us to regard it as an independent creation.

The proofs of these resemblances are given in detail and illustrated by drawings. Mr. Lethaby reads his building as a document, and he traces its composite elements with the security with which Dr. Luard analyzed the *Flores Historiarum*. The internal evidence, so to speak, appears irrefragable ; but we could wish to see it supported by external evidence—by some historic reference to intercourse between the English and the French masons. Did our master masons travel to see the work of their contemporaries ? or did French masters come over here and give their guidance ? We find a French marbler, Master Richard Paris, and a famous French painter, John St. Omer, in the earliest accompts ; but these names do not offer a solution of the problem, and no evidence has been brought to shew that Master Henry ever crossed the Channel.

Great as are the similarities between our English church and the churches of France, the contrasts are not less significant, and we welcome the considered verdict which claims it after all as ‘one of the most English of English buildings’ :

‘We may readily make the fullest allowance for French influence at Westminster, for so entirely is it translated into the terms of English detail that the result is triumphantly English’ (p. 125).

His enthusiasm for the great north porch has led Mr. Lethaby to make some trenchant criticisms upon its recent remodelling ; but he does more than idly complain of what is new—he gives us a minute study of its original form.

The interesting pencil drawing of it, which must be Hollar's first sketch, and which chances to be preserved in Pepys' scrap-book at Magdalene College, Cambridge, has not escaped him. A yet earlier representation of it, however, is to be seen on a seal exhibited in the Chapter House. When the Dean and prebendaries were abolished by the Long Parliament, the Abbey was ruled at first by a Committee of both Houses, and after 1649 by a body called the Governors of the School and Almshouses of Westminster. Never were the finances of the Abbey more carefully handled than by those eminent laymen : every item of expenditure was noted, every voucher was kept. Among the bills there remains a receipt from Thomas Symons, the London goldsmith, for 25*l.* for making the new seal of the Governors. This seal had on one side the House of Commons in session, and on the other the great north porch of the Abbey church. The one impression which happens to remain is fortunately a good one : it is reproduced in Mr. Russell Barker's *Life of Dr. Busby*. This seal and Hollar's first sketch (though not his subsequent engraving) give the only existing pictures of the house on the right hand of the porch, which was occupied by William Laud when he was a prebendary, and at the back door of which, in the irony of history, the bodies of most of the Parliamentarians exhumed at the Restoration were ignominiously reinterred.

Mr. Lethaby is probably right in conjecturing that the foundations which still exist beneath the grass at this spot are those of the great Sacristy, which King Henry III. ordered to be built in 1251. A prebendary's house stood there in the time of King Edward VI., and next to it was a tenement once called Mason's Lodge. There is an item in the fabric rolls for the building of a lodge for the masons, and we may fairly assign this as its site. The dimensions and position of Mason's Lodge are ascertainable from the leases of later years, and it is interesting to note that it stood just 120 feet to the west of the north porch ; for King Henry III.'s Sacristy was ordered to be 120 feet long. A further confirmation of this position for the Sacristy is to be found in the Sacrists' roll for 1535, where there is an entry

of fourpence expended 'for pyche, rossen and canvas for mending of a pype in Sent Margetts churchyarde cumyng to the sextery.'

Another house is shewn on the seal of the Governors, standing east of the north porch. It is probable that this occupied the site of the plumbery and waxchandlery, which formed part of the Sacrist's offices. As the Sacristy could be entered from the nave by what is now called 'the Demons' Door,' so these offices had direct communication with the north transept by a door in its eastern wall. Among the early Chapter Orders (July 9, 1547) is one to the effect that the plumbery and waxchandlery be removed to the vaults under the great granary (in Dean's Yard—long used as the school dormitory), and that the door into the church be 'mured up.' This door was opened again by Mr. Pearson in 1896; if our identification be correct, Mr. Lethaby's sigh over the removal of the filling—'probably mediæval and done c. 1400 when the chapel was made'—may be recalled.

It would be easy to give further proof that *Westminster Abbey and the Kings' Craftsmen* is a book which makes a solid contribution to the history of the Abbey from the architectural and artistic points of view. Nothing so thorough has yet been achieved, and we may hope that its author, who has hitherto known only so much of the Abbey muniments as can be learnt from the Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, will prosecute his searches still further under more favourable conditions. There still waits for him a field of interest in the investigation and identification of the extensive remains of the monastic buildings. In regard to these our best source of information is a paper written by Mr. Micklethwaite many years before he came into official connexion with the Abbey. So far as he had access to the ancient work, much of which is covered up in the houses built for prebendaries and other residents in the Close, his descriptions are excellent. His knowledge of monastic institutions made him an admirable interpreter of what he saw. But his identifications often rested on materials gathered in a somewhat



haphazard manner by the late Mr. Walcott, and he did not as a rule go behind the printed sources. We are accordingly still left in doubt as to the site of the Prior's house, though it was of considerable extent and contained a hall and a chapel; and the position confidently assigned by Walcott and all subsequent antiquaries to the Misericord, in which the monks commonly dined in later times, is almost certainly wrong. The two problems perhaps are to be solved together, and it may be that when we have transferred the Misericord to its true place on the map, we shall find a reasonable space for the Prior's lodging. When the new Bishop of Westminster displaced the Abbot from his ancient house, what could be more likely than that the latter, now become Dean, should occupy the house of next dignity within the precincts? Dionysius Dalyon, the Prior, had become a prebendary indeed, but only in the sixth stall, with five seniors above him brought in from outside; he could therefore have no kind of claim to remain where he was. We know as a fact that the new Dean's house occupied a part at least of the ground on which Ashburnham House now stands—and it is the other part of that house which has hitherto been held to be the site of the Misericord. Presently we shall believe that the Misericord was 'contiguous to the Refectory,' as the old Customary has long told us: we shall also find a reason for thinking that, as at Durham, it was not on the ground-floor. The topography of the precincts, in fact, has been very scantily investigated. The ancient leases prove that in letting houses to eminent persons within the Close the Dean and Chapter made no new departure: besides less conspicuous examples we actually find Abbot Esteney in the first year of King Henry VII. letting his own house to Elizabeth Wydeville, the widowed Queen of Edward IV., with a special clause in the lease for the cleansing and repair of the gutter of the kitchen. Twice before had she taken sanctuary here, but now she was not allowed to remain in such close proximity to the Court and was removed to a perpetual seclusion in the Abbey of Bermondsey. The early leases and others of a later date incidentally mention the adjoining monastic

buildings, and offer material out of which it may presently be possible to map out the precincts with sufficient exactness.

When we turn from the buildings to the men who lived in them, we find much ready to our hand which should help us to realize the manner of their life. The Henry Bradshaw Society has done excellent service in printing the great Missal of Abbot Litlington, the cost of the making of which in 1384 has been found in the Muniment Room. Even more important guidance as to the liturgical practice, as well as to the social life, of the Abbey is furnished by the same Society's edition of Abbot Ware's Customary. This was one of several books which escaped from its proper custody into the Cottonian Library; and it was partially burnt within the precincts in the lamentable fire at Ashburnham House. Forty years ago its charred pages were copied so far as was possible by the skill of the present Director of the British Museum. Then it was pointed out by Mr. Edmund Bishop that a Customary of St. Augustine's Canterbury so closely resembled ours that by its aid many of the gaps could be securely filled. Both of the Customsaries are now printed and challenge critical investigation. The Westminster book was begun in 1266, but it contains entries subsequent to the death of King Henry III. It is based on the much less elaborate Constitutions of Lanfranc, portions of which it frequently embodies. The Canterbury Customary will almost certainly prove to be a revision of the Westminster book with a view to its adaptation to local requirements—a revision which sometimes leaves Westminster peculiarities imperfectly eliminated. Conservative as the monasteries were, we must nevertheless be on our guard against arguing from a thirteenth century Customary in dealing with later periods. Specially must we bear in mind that its topographical references belong to the Norman Abbey. Litlington's rebuilding of the monastic offices and of the Abbot's house came a century later; and one change that he made was to move the Cellarer's department from the west side of the cloister to give the Abbot more room. The new

choir was not consecrated when this book was begun, and the Norman nave was walled off from the new work. That a warning at this point is not unnecessary will presently appear.

The history of the monastery reaches its climax, and practically its close, with the rule of a great Abbot. We shall never get another such picture of an English Abbot as Jocelyn of Brakelond has drawn of Abbot Sampson; the biographer and his subject form one of those happy conjunctions which produce permanent literature. But a modern historian could find records enough to write a straightforward account of Abbot Islip, which would be a useful illustration of the last days of monasticism in England. Githslepe or Islip, near Oxford, was the Confessor's birthplace and he bestowed it on his new Abbey. The monks frequently found recruits among the clever boys on their country estates: in religion the surname was dropped, and the local designation took its place. The surname of John Islip has not yet been found, though it has been shrewdly conjectured for more than one reason that it may have been Giles. In a curious note-book, which contains the fragment of a diary and many pages of accompts, Islip on becoming Prior in 1498 recorded the leading dates of his life. He became a monk in his sixteenth year on St. Benedict's day, 1480; he sang his first Mass on the Feast of the Circumcision, 1486, before he was twenty-two, in accordance with a special privilege of Westminster; the next year he became Chaplain to the Abbot, and in 1492 Treasurer and Monk Bailey. We may add that he was elected Abbot in 1500, and died in 1532.

This note-book preserves a story which Islip heard told at the Abbot's table on Sunday, March 3, 1493. A priest travelling with his servants had deflected from the main road, and put up for the night at a lonely inn. In stabling the horses the servants find under the straw two corpses. Their master calls the hostess, and declares that he must leave at once. She pleads that the supper is cooked, and demands a reason for his unusual conduct. He is forced to tell her what has been discovered, and she readily



explains that two knights were there the previous day, and their servants quarrelled and fought : her husband had undertaken to bury the corpses secretly. Over-persuaded, but ill at ease, the priest remained. At night, as he lay on his bed, still dressed, the landlord came to the door, offering him apples and wine. When he refused to open, the landlord broke in with eleven men behind him, and bade the priest prepare himself for instant death. The good man thoughtfully requested that he might shrive his servants, who were to share his fate. The ruse saved him ; they fought desperately and drove off their assailants with much loss, and went unharmed on their way. The story is well told in Islip's homely but sufficient Latin ; and we may regret that, as so often happens, the enthusiasm of the diarist did not extend beyond a few pages.

When George Fascet was made Abbot, in 1498, John Islip succeeded him as Prior : and two years later, October 27, 1500, he succeeded him as Abbot. The notarial instrument describing and attesting his election is printed in full by Widmore in his appendix (pp. 234-244). On the day before, John Islip the Prior and thirty-eight monks assembled in the Chapter House in the presence of Thomas Chamberlayn the notary, Richard Rawlyns, doctor in divinity, Edward Vaughan and William Haryngton, doctors in law ; they declared the vacancy, and announced that they had the King's licence to elect a new Abbot ; then they fixed the election for Tuesday, October 27, with power to adjourn if necessary. On the morrow at the time appointed, the Prior and forty-three monks were present : the Mass of the Holy Ghost was sung at the high altar, and when it was finished the bells sounded for the Chapter. When all were assembled, Dr. Rawlyns preached from the text, *Pro patribus tuis nati sunt tibi filii : constitues eos principes*. No one present could have foreseen the illustration of the text which the next half century would bring ; few survived to see the old order pass into the new ; yet a young monk, Thomas Elfride by name, took part in that election and lived to be installed as a prebendary in December 1540.

The sermon ended, *Veni Creator* was sung, and the

letters patent of King Henry VII. were read, bidding them to elect a new Abbot, 'qui Deo devotus, ecclesiae vestrae necessarius, nobisque et regno nostro utilis et fidelis existat.' The Prior and convent then nominated Edward Vaughan to be director of the election, and the notary, the preacher and four others to be witnesses. The names of all the monks were read, and it was declared that all who had a right to vote were present. Proclamation was next made at the Chapter House door that all who claimed an interest in the election should come and assert their claim, and a solemn monition and protestation was entered against the participation of any disqualified person in the election. Then Master Vaughan read out the conciliar constitution, *Quia propter*, setting forth the forms of election, and demanded of the Prior and convent by what method they desired to proceed. They answered that they would proceed *per viam Spiritus Sancti*, and William Lambard, the second of the seniors,<sup>1</sup> rose and nominated the Prior, John Islip. At once, without interval, consultation, or even signal—'by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as it is firmly believed'—the whole body of monks with one mouth and one heart proclaimed Islip the Abbot of their choice.<sup>2</sup> Then William Lambard, with the consent of all but the Prior himself, declared the election complete and proceeded to record it in writing. The Sub-prior, John Holond, hereupon became president of the Chapter, and with the assent of his brethren, Islip as before excepted, empowered Master Edward Vaughan to announce the result. *Te Deum* was chanted by the monks as they led Islip through the cloister to the high altar, where Master Vaughan standing by his side proclaimed the election to the clergy and people. The Sub-prior and his brethren returned without Islip to the Chapter House, and nominated as proctors William Lambard and

<sup>1</sup> The senior of all, John Ramsay, had not been present on the previous day; and possibly he was too infirm to take a prominent part.

<sup>2</sup> At the election of Ralph de Bourne as Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in 1309, the monks decided '*per viam procedere compromissi*,' i.e. by choosing seven of their number as electors, and pledging themselves to accept their choice. The whole proceeding is described in the *Canterbury Customary* (H.B.S.) i. 16-31.

Richard Charyng, the next in seniority, to convey the formal announcement of his election to their Abbot-elect, and to use their utmost entreaties to bring him to accept the office. The proctors proceeded with the notary and two of the witnesses to a parlour in the Prior's lodging, where, after a first refusal, Islip yielded and gave in writing his formal consent.

A curious chance has preserved to us a document which carries on the story. On a fly-leaf of Abbot Litlington's Missal there is a copy of the notarial instrument which records the solemn reception of the new Abbot by the convent, and his taking the customary oath. On November 25, Islip, escorted by a distinguished company, came from the Chapel of St. Mary Magdalen, near Tothill, and was met in the cemetery, not far from the west door of the church, by five of the senior monks. One of these, John Waterden, the infirmarer, handed him a schedule containing the Abbot's oath to observe 'all rights, statutes, and laudable constitutions and customs of the monastery,' as they were observed by the Abbots his predecessors. He recited the oath, and kissed the Book of the Gospels. He then advanced and was met by the Sub-prior and the monks, bearing Book, Cross and Pastoral Staff. He knelt and kissed the Book, and they all moved on in procession into the church.

The new Abbot, following the example of his two predecessors, Esteney and Fascet, took into his own hands the Sacrist's office, to which belonged the chief responsibility for the maintenance of the fabric. Esteney was already Sacrist when he was made Abbot, and it was probably his interest in the building operations that led him to keep the office; he did much to complete the west end of the nave, and the great west window is attributed to him. Islip seems to have gone on with the work: in his Funeral Roll, to which we shall presently come, a wheel is figured on one of the towers, as an indication of building in progress. He also made the stone screens which, till a hundred years ago, enclosed the chapel, probably of St. Christopher, under the north-west tower.



But the west end of the church was destined to remain unfinished, and the King's attention was absorbed in his magnificent scheme for the rebuilding of the Lady Chapel. In February and March 1498, Fascet the Prior and Islip the Monk Bailey had represented the dying Abbot in the controversy between Chertsey, Windsor, and Westminster, as to the final resting-place of King Henry VI. The new work at Windsor was already set on foot, but when Westminster obtained the verdict, the King at once decided to erect a new Lady Chapel at the Abbey. On January 24, 1503, the Abbot and others, on the King's behalf, laid the first stone of the new building. Large sums were intrusted to Islip, and the work was pushed rapidly forward. Lady Margaret, the King's mother, undertook the furnishing and endowment of a chantry in the south aisle of the new chapel, and already before her death, which followed the King's in 1509, Masses were being said there by Thomas Elfride and others of the monks.

In two other parts of the Abbey, building was going forward under Abbot Islip. More than a century before, Litlington had completely rebuilt the Abbot's House, including the Hall and the Jerusalem Chamber. The latter was connected with the southern portion of the house by a long gallery. For that part of the gallery which crossed the south base of the south-west tower Islip now substituted a building of two stories and a ground floor; and at the back of it he made an oratory with an oriel window opening on the nave of the church. It would seem that this was 'my Lord's new chapel,' which now comes to be mentioned in the Sub-sacrist's accounts side by side with the 'Jesus Chapel.'

This Jesus Chapel has set a problem to the antiquaries on which they have expended some mistaken ingenuity. They have known it hitherto only from an inventory made at the Suppression. Citing inaccurately the language of this inventory, and interpreting it by statements drawn from the Customary of the thirteenth century and from the 'Rites of Durham,' they have started a tradition (which has already found its way into the guide books) of a 'Jesus

altar below' in the nave, and a 'Jesus altar above' in the loft between the nave and the choir. As the whole question of 'Jesus mass' and 'Jesus anthem' is still under discussion among liturgiologists, it may be worth while to state the pertinent facts as regards the church of Westminster.

We must premise that the new devotion in question became exceedingly popular in England in the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. This can be shewn for parish churches in the country by many churchwardens' accounts. In the cathedrals and other great churches, it was not uncommon for benefactors to provide for a 'Jesus mass' to be sung every Friday in the year, and sometimes for a 'Jesus anthem' also to be sung after Compline on the same days.<sup>1</sup> At Lincoln the Jesus mass was sung with organ accompaniment before a crucifix on the south side of the church (c. 1514-1536). At Lichfield some twenty years earlier there was a provision for both mass and anthem. There was a like provision at Durham, c. 1515; and in the 'Rites of Durham,' we have an elaborate description of a 'Jesus altar' within a wainscot 'closett or porch' in the midst of the nave under the great Rood; moreover, 'there was on the north syde betwixt two pillers a loofft for the m<sup>r</sup> and quiresters to sing Jesus mass every fridaie, conteyninge a paire of orgaines to play on' (pp. 32 *sqq.*).

At Westminster there appears to be no mention of a 'Jesus altar,' but there was a 'Jesus chapel.' In one of the Suppression Inventories, printed by Walcott in the *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archæological Society* for August, 1873, we have the record of the furniture of a long list of chapels. After those of St. John Evangelist and St. John Baptist, and before that of St. Paul, comes the Jesus chapel.

Its contents are described under two headings: *Jhesus Chapell benneth* and *Jhesus Chapell above*. Walcott appends the note: 'This is clearly Abbot Islip's chantry'; and it is strange that his judgement should ever have been disputed.

<sup>1</sup> See the notes in the new edition of the *Rites of Durham* (Surtees Society, 1903), pp. 220 *sqq.*

Islip's chantry, with its upper and lower compartments, is in the neighbourhood in question, the order of the chapels being, in fact—St. John Evangelist, Islip's chantry, St. John Baptist, and St. Paul.

Moreover, the commissioners found in the lower compartment of the Jesus chapel 'a ffront for the nether of the auter of rede and whit damaske with Abbott Islyp's armys'; and in the upper 'another ffront for the auter of rede and whit damaske with armys of abot Yslip,' and 'an upper front of whit and rede damaske with a Crucyffix Mary and John, with Jhus and Abbott Yslips Armys all in brothered.' The symbols of Abbot Islip on both the altars naturally suggest that this Jesus chapel was his chantry; and the next chapel, that of St. Paul, offers an exact parallel; for there were 'my lord Dawbiney's Arms in broderyd' on the upper front of the altar before which lies Giles Lord Daubeney.

Again, in the 'Jesus chapel above' there stood 'a payer of Organys with a corten of lynen cloth to cover them.' This was for the musical accompaniment of the Jesus mass or anthem. The same inventory begins by mentioning 'ii payre of organes in the quyre.' It is of interest to note that in the early years of Queen Elizabeth, a quarter of a century afterwards, there were not only 'the great wooden organs in the loft' over the quire, but also organs in King Henry the Seventh's Chapel, used for the early morning service; probably Islip's organ had been moved to serve this new purpose.

We know from the Islip Roll and from Weever's description that the Crucifixion was depicted above the altars of Islip's chantry, and this accords with its use as a Jesus chapel. And, as if to crown the proof of identity, there still remains carved in stone above the doorway of Islip's chantry the symbol IHS. This symbol, as we have seen, was powdered together with 'Yslips Armys' on the red and white damask of the altar front; but it is not common in the Abbey church, if indeed it occurs at all except in modern work.

A word must be said as to the mistake which in recent times has imagined a 'Jesus altar' in the nave. It appears



to be founded partly on the 'Rites of Durham' and partly on a passage in Abbot Ware's Customary, which says that the Sacrist is bound to find five lamps to burn ceaselessly day and night in the church, according to right and ancient custom: one before the altar of Holy Cross in the nave; another before St. Paul's altar and the figure of the Crucified, to which figure the people go up by steps on one side and down on the other to kiss its feet; the third before the old altar of the Blessed Mary; the fourth before that of the Trinity; and the fifth before that of St. Benedict.

The Customary dates from 1266, though it has insertions here and there as late as 1273. The new Choir began to be used in 1269, but the Lady Chapel had been finished long before. The custom here described refers to altars in the Norman nave, the 'old altar' of St. Mary being that which had been superseded by the Lady Chapel. These facts must be borne in mind when we come to make conjectures as to the position of the five altars which had lamps perpetually burning before them. The altar of Holy Cross, which had a candle in a basin beneath its lamp, to be lighted on festivals and whenever the 'greater mass' was sung, was plainly the principal altar at the east end of the nave, and before the wall which blocked off the new work of the Choir. But we must not assume that above it was a great Roodloft with two staircases and an altar at the top. Where St. Paul's altar and the Crucifix stood, we cannot tell: it is not necessary to imagine a loft at all: a few steps may have led to a platform from which the feet of the Crucifix could be kissed, as it hung between two pillars. We have nothing to help us to place the other three altars. Especially must we beware of arguing from this ancient arrangement to the state of things at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the new devotion of the 'Jesus mass' had come to require a place in the completed church.<sup>1</sup>

If any doubt be thought to remain as to the identifica-

<sup>1</sup> The view contested here is set forth in brief by Mr. Micklethwaite in Miss Bradley's (Mrs. Murray Smith's) *Annals of Westminster Abbey*, 1898, p. 390; and it has been developed somewhat unfortunately by Mr. Lethaby in *Westminster Abbey and its Craftsmen*, 1906, p. 26.

tion of Islip's chapel with the Jesus chapel, it may be set at rest by a bill of 1530, from which some part may be quoted :

' Payementes made by thandes of Dan John Fulwell at the commaundement of my lord of Westm<sup>r</sup> as hereafter ensewyth.

Fyrst payed to master humfrey for the last payement of his bargeyn for payntyng uppon the wall in Ihs Chappell, with vii<sup>s</sup> vi<sup>d</sup> for hys reward . . . vii<sup>li</sup> x<sup>d</sup>

Item payed for ii payer of candelstykkes one for the Ihs chappell and the other for my lordes chappell at chenygates . . . viii<sup>s</sup>

' Item payed to John Ellys for makyng of the V woondes over the stayre at Ihs chappell in gret . . . iii<sup>s</sup> iiiii<sup>d</sup>

' Item payed to master humfrey for payntyng of the same in gret . . . v<sup>s</sup>

' Item payed to Antony newman for mending of the organs in Ihs Chappell in gret . . . xv<sup>s</sup>.'

It appears from this account that the decoration of Islip's chapel was not completed until two years before his death. Mr. Lethaby will forgive our criticizing his attribution of its locality in return for the name of a new master painter.

From this digression we must return to Abbot Islip. We have used his name to shew by an example that much remains to be written of the history of Westminster Abbey ; and the illustration would be far from complete if we did not refer to the notable documents which tell the story of his funeral. The first of these is a full description in English of the ceremonial of his interment. The Abbot died at his manor house of Neyte, on Sunday, May 12, 1532. He lay in state till Thursday afternoon, when all his monks and the Abbot of Bury brought him in procession to Westminster. The procession, which is elaborately described, included Richmond and Lancaster Heralds, and was followed by so many of the Westminster folk, that it extended all the way from Neyte to Tothill Street. When they came into the choir, the body 'was set under a goodly herse' with lights and banners and scutcheons.

' Then Dirige began, solemnly sung by the said monastery, and divers Dirige's done in other places of the church ; which

being done with the other ceremonies, the morners with thother departid unto a place over the Chappell of the defuncte, where was prepared for them spiced breade, suckett, marmylate, spiced plate, and dyversse sourts of Wines plentie. And in the meane ceason they of the Church did burye the defuncte in the seid Chappell of his buyldynge. . . . Then in the choir underneath the herse was made a presentation of the corps covered with a cloth of gold of tyshew . . . which being done every man departed for that night.'

The next day two masses were sung—the Mass of our Lady and the Mass of the Trinity—with offerings at each from the mourners. After refreshment came the Mass of Requiem, sung by the Abbot of Bury *in pontificalibus*. A great dole was given to the poor, and the mourners dined in the manor-place.<sup>1</sup> The herse remained 'until the month's mynde.'

After this almost regal pomp of burial, we can readily understand that the Brief, in which the Abbot's decease was to be announced to other monasteries, should be of more than usual splendour. With this intention an artist of the first rank was secured—some, indeed, have declared that it must have Holbein himself. The outline sketch of a series of exquisite pictures alone remains to bear witness to the insecurity of ecclesiastical institutions in the period which immediately followed Islip's death. The famous Islip Roll was never completed. Its later history is a curious one. Where it was for two centuries and a half we cannot tell, nor how it became possible for a certain prebendary named Drummond to present it to the Chapter Library in 1747.<sup>2</sup> How it left the Library we have lately

<sup>1</sup> That is to say, the manor of Cheynegates, as the Abbot's House was called. The document quoted above is printed by Widmore (pp. 206–210): misled by the statement which heads it, to the effect that the Abbot died at Westminster, he prints unintelligibly 'from next,' instead of 'from Neyt,' in his account of the length of the procession.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Hay, who afterwards took the name of Drummond, was son of Lord Kinnoull. At six years of age he was brought to Westminster School by Matthew Prior and entered under Dr. Freind. Some years later, while he was playing in *Julius Caesar* before King George II. and Queen Caroline, his ostrich plumes caught fire, but he courageously went on with his part. He was Prebendary of Westminster from 1743–



learned from Mr. St. John Hope, who discovered that it was lent to the Society of Antiquaries by Dean Thomas in 1791. The Dean gave permission for the reproduction of the drawings, and died in 1793, leaving no record of the loan. A reproduction was made in 1807, but the roll remained with the Antiquaries. Under the editorship of Mr. Hope the Society published a more accurate facsimile in 1906. Shortly before its issue, the Dean and Chapter had become aware from an old book of donations to the Library that the roll had once been theirs. At a special meeting of the Society of Antiquaries, held in the old Abbot's Hall on January 31, 1907, the precious roll was restored with friendly courtesy to the Dean and Chapter. Its pictures are of great merit in themselves, and are a valuable record of many details of the church and its ornaments. The letter-press which now accompanies their reproduction gives an excellent account of the *brevicula* in which the prayers of other communities were desired for brethren deceased.

Thus the official career of the last great Abbot of Westminster—perhaps the greatest of his line—is illustrated at its opening and its close by a unique series of documents. Of his private life we shall never perhaps know more than is told us by a recurring item in his accounts, which shews that he was contributing to the maintenance of his sister. But of the fortunes of the abbey under Islip's administration much remains to be written—from its enrichment out of the smaller priories in King Henry VII.'s will to the unfair exchanges of Islip's last years, by which the greed of King Henry VIII. took St. James's Park and other valuable properties at Westminster, giving in return lands held by the Carthusians of Mount Grace, and by other houses whose downfall presaged the general pillage. Wolsey's visitation, arranged, postponed, and ultimately held, cost money; Cromwell in his turn had to be paid. When Islip lay dying,

1748, then Bishop of St. Asaph for twelve years, and afterwards Archbishop of York and Lord High Almoner to the King. Before he left Westminster he gave to the Chapter Library 'a Drawing on Vellum representing various Things relating to Abbot Islip.'

the deluge had begun : Katharine was already banished from the palace : the King had claimed the Headship of the Church. The day before Islip's funeral, Convocation had been forced to make the declaration known as the Submission of the Clergy ; on the day on which he was borne in procession to his grave, the King received back the Great Seal from Sir Thomas More. Fitly does Stanley remark that as we look upon the pageant of the Islip Roll ' we seem to be following to their end the funeral of the Middle Ages.'

His successor, a monk of Peterborough, was the first Abbot for three hundred years who was not a son of the house. It is suspected that he bought his place from Cromwell ; at any rate, he was ready, when the time came, to make the great surrender. The last flash of the glory of Benedictine Westminster had been seen at Islip's funeral. The monastery fell for no positive sins of its own : not a breath of scandal seems to have touched it ; Islip and his monks, for aught we know, were as respectable as any Dean and his prebendaries since.

Indeed, the fall was the softest possible. The Abbot became the Dean ; the Prior and five monks made up half the number of the new prebendaries, and other monks held minor posts in the new foundation. The old ritual remained, though the services were curtailed : the masses were but three each day, and—what must have grated on the old Westminster sentiment—the ordinary for the first ten years was a bishop. The Abbey church had become for the nonce the cathedral of a new diocese ; singing men and children were provided for, and the monastic school became the cathedral grammar-school. It was the next reign that brought devastation.

Before an adequate history of the Black Monks of Westminster can be written, there is much preliminary work to be done. It is strange that Flete's *History* should never have been printed. John Flete was Prior in 1456. His book is to a great extent a compilation, with large extracts from royal charters and papal bulls. He has written somewhat sparse and disappointing Lives of the Abbots as far as Litlington, transcribing at tedious length

the documents relating to their anniversaries. He makes a quaint digression to describe the yearly tribute of salmon, and the controversies that arose concerning it ; and he has a long chapter on the Abbey relics and their donors. The manuscript lies in the Chapter Library, and was used by Dart and, more scientifically, by Widmore. Its first editor would have to take account of a manuscript in the Cottonian collection at the British Museum, written by a later monk, Richard Sporley, who for the most part only copied Flete.

There are several Chartularies, some in the Muniment Room and some in the British Museum, which need to be systematically described. They overlap a good deal, and many of the documents contained in them are copies of which the originals are preserved ; but there is much interesting matter hidden away in them. The most valuable book of this class is called the *Liber Niger Quaternus*, and is often quoted by Widmore : the largest was in Dean Goodman's time referred to as 'Domesday,' a name which was also given to a similar book at St. Paul's. Besides these there is a series of Registers, beginning with King Henry VII.'s reign, which contain copies of leases and other documents which passed the seal.

A vast mass of records relates to the Abbey estates, and among these are found in some instances all the 'evidences' of smaller monastic houses, such as Hurley Priory, whose lands came to the Abbey at their suppression. Incidental information as to Westminster is often to be gathered from these sources. But far more directly important are the rolls of the Sacrists and of the many other officials of the monastery, and the fabric rolls of the *novum opus*. And then there is the multitude of scattered documents, letters, protests, bills, &c., which cannot be made properly available until Dr. Scott's index is completed.

A series of monographs should precede any further attempt to write the history of the Abbey of Westminster. Such a series might contain an edition of the principal royal charters, an edition of Flete, a study of the Sacrists' rolls, and another of the fabric rolls, essays on the chief monastic buildings, on the topography of the precincts,



and of Westminster outside the precincts—these last to be based mainly on a minute examination of the leases. Work of this kind is laborious, and when it is done, it appeals but to very few. Still no labour can be thrown away which helps to illustrate an institution which lies so near to the heart of English life ; nor, again, will it be possible to write the history of Benedictine monasticism in England until Westminster has made its necessary contribution.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

#### ART. IV.—THE CHURCH OF DENMARK.

1. *Den nordiske Kirkes Grundlæggelse.* By A. D. JÖRGENSEN. (Copenhagen, 1874-78.)
2. *Den angelsachsiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den norske.* By A. TARANGER. (Christiania, 1890.)
3. *Fra Grundtvigianismus og den Indre Missions Tid.* By L. KOCH. (Copenhagen, 1898.)
4. *Halvgrundtvigianismen eller Bogstavdyrkelsen.* By C. H. SCHARLING. (Copenhagen, 1893.)

and many other works.

BEDE's well-known statement according to which the home of the English before they settled in Britain was in Sleswick seems to be open to some doubt ; but at any rate the English and the Danes were kindred peoples. Before the viking ages there were also peaceful relations and even a kind of literary intercourse between them, and after the invasions of the Danes in England the relations were not altogether hostile. The languages of the two nations were so much alike that an Englishman would have no great difficulty in understanding a viking.<sup>1</sup>

Historians have made full investigations of the early sojournings of the Danes in England, and philologists have shewn that the language of the settlers has had a lasting effect upon that of the natives. Unfortunately, there has

<sup>1</sup> Otto Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language* (Williams & Norgate, 1905), p. 60 sqq.

not been so much attention paid to the relations of the two national Churches. It is true there is no question of a continuous spiritual intercourse except in that period of intermingling of the two nations, but those very beginnings are of considerable interest. And the student who tries to trace further through the subsequent centuries any evidence of communication between the Churches finds now and then points of contact some of which, however slight they may be in themselves, bear witness to a spiritual relationship corresponding to that of blood.

Christianity was originally introduced into Denmark from Germany, but it is now becoming more and more clear that the Church of England too shared very largely in the foundation and organization of the Danish Church. The strong influence of the neighbouring country towards the south dates from a later time; during the first two or three centuries the English influence seems to have been paramount. It appears from a very able book by Mr. (now Professor) A. Taranger of Christiania that the Church in Norway was a daughter of that in England and in its laws and customs modelled after the pattern of the mother Church.<sup>1</sup> Even though in the case of Denmark the relations were not exactly the same from the beginning, yet they appear soon to have become so. Some few years ago the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences proposed the subject for a prize essay. Not having been answered the question has been put out a second time, and the prize gained by a Danish lady, Miss E. S. R. Jørgensen. It is to be hoped that one day such sources as are available, scanty as they are indeed, may be published. Here we propose to give only a few hints for which we are indebted to modern writers.

When the Christian faith was first preached in Denmark by Ansgar, 'the Apostle of the North,' more than two hundred years had elapsed since the foundation of the see

<sup>1</sup> *Den angelsachsiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den norske* (Kristiania, 1890). On broader lines the history of the Church in Norway down to the Reformation has been written in English by Mr. T. B. Willson—*History of the Church and State in Norway, from the Tenth to the Sixteenth Century*. (Constable: 1903).

of Canterbury. Thus the heathen vikings who crossed the North Sea came to a Christian country, to the Church of which their invasions were a very sore trial. In their ravagings and plunderings they destroyed the churches and monasteries, and disorganized the congregations; episcopal sees remained vacant, and in some cases bishoprics were not revived.<sup>1</sup> Most of the religious houses that had become parochial rectories were ruined, the greater houses were not at once re-occupied on the restoration of order, and most of the smaller houses disappeared.<sup>2</sup>

‘ But gospel truth is potent to allay  
Fierceness and rage ; and soon the cruel Dane  
Feels, through the influence of her gentle reign,  
His native superstitions melt away.’

In these lines, which a Danish lover of Wordsworth does not easily forget, the poet has depicted the noble revenge taken by the English. After their settlement the invaders, throughout the whole Danelaw, were Christianized, and in the tenth century gave three archbishops to the English Church.<sup>3</sup> But Danes were not found in the Danelaw only ; there were some of them also among the men around the kings. Thus it was the Danish chancellor Thorketel who accompanied the daughters of King Edward to Germany that Otto the Great might choose one of them for his wife.<sup>4</sup> After that time there was a numerous population of converted Danes in England, but many of them returned to their fatherland carrying with them the faith they had adopted abroad, and in this way the formative period in the history of the newly-founded Church in Denmark came to reflect the Christian civilization of England.

The English influence, of course, reached its summit in the reign of Cnut. Englishmen were instrumental in

<sup>1</sup> Hunt, *The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England*, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 267.

<sup>4</sup> A. D. Jörgensen, *Den nordiske Kirkes Grundlæggelse* (Copenhagen, 1874-78), p. 187.



completing the conversion of the people and organizing the Church among them. It seems that Cnut even made an attempt to give the see of Canterbury a certain superiority over the Danish bishops. It is a fact, at least, that he caused Archbishop Ethelnoth to consecrate three bishops, obviously of Danish origin, for the dioceses of Scania, Sealand, and Fuenen. This greatly displeased Unwan, the Archbishop of Bremen, who claimed to be Metropolitan of the Scandinavian countries; he caught the new Bishop of Roskilde in Sealand at sea, forced him to make a profession of obedience, and wrote to Cnut complaining of the infringement of his rights; and the King promised that he would respect them in future.<sup>1</sup> During the reign of Cnut the Church in Denmark made considerable progress in its internal organization, no doubt owing in an extraordinary degree to tendencies originating in the older and far more advanced national Church which had become its model. From the country he delighted to call his second home Cnut sent many bishops and priests to Denmark. Very likely most of them were Danes by birth, but they were trained in England.<sup>2</sup> The little that is known about the Church life in Denmark in those times suggests that it was an English growth in Danish soil or, at least, was quickened by zealous Englishmen and Anglo-Danes. The Danish Church had come into touch with influences which imparted to it a culture that it would not otherwise have attained so soon. During the reigns of Svend Estridsen (1047-1076) and his sons and followers the Church was prospering; new bishoprics were erected and churches of stone were built, among others Roskilde Cathedral. When the first great monastery was founded, in Odense (in Fuenen) by Eric the Good-natured (1095-1103), he invited monks from Evesham to come over to Denmark; not a few obeyed the call, and for a long while an active communication continued between the two monasteries.<sup>3</sup> Those English monks had a considerable part in the creation of Christian culture in Denmark. It is therefore very characteristic

<sup>1</sup> Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 397.

<sup>2</sup> A. D. Jørgensen, *op. cit.* p. 447.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Johannes Steenstrup in *Dansk Tidsskrift*, 1898, p. 159.

that, when literary activity began in this country, the first Lives of the Saints were committed to writing not by Germans but by Englishmen. Archbishop Ethelnoth related at great length the history of St. Cnut, and likewise Robert of Ely that of Cnut Lavard (Lord). Here it may also be mentioned that certain circumstances go to indicate that the Church in Aarhus, in Jutland, which was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, had some connexion with Winchester Cathedral.<sup>1</sup>

From the beginning of the twelfth century the German influence was gaining ascendancy in Denmark. The current of English Church life had slackened, yet not ceased; we still meet with an English name now and then in the annals of the Danish Church. The instances recorded are few indeed and far between, but all the more worthy of note. Down to the twelfth century the Danish bishops remained suffragans of the Archbishop of Bremen. It was not until 1104 that the see of Lund, in Scania, was raised to metropolitan rank with jurisdiction over all the Scandinavian countries; and it was only in 1152 that the famous mission took place of the Cardinal Albino, the Englishman Breakspear (afterwards Pope Adrian IV.), which gave to the northern churches their permanent character.<sup>2</sup>

In the thirteenth century the great religious movement caused by the Franciscans found its way to Denmark from Germany, the friars who first crossed the border of the country coming from Thuringia. But as an indication of the still lingering English sway we may notice the interesting statement that from the Northern countries repeated applications were made for English friars, and that on one occasion Bishop Grosseteste endeavoured to bring about a mission of Franciscans to Denmark.<sup>3</sup>

During the closing centuries of the Middle Ages the Church in Denmark became more and more uniform with the ecclesiastical system which prevailed throughout Western Christendom; but there is nothing in its history

<sup>1</sup> A. D. Jörgensen, *op. cit.* pp. 202 sq., 338.

<sup>2</sup> *The Cambridge Modern History*, ii. p. 601.

<sup>3</sup> F. S. Stevenson, *Robert Grosseteste*, pp. 75, 82.

in those times to suggest any close relation with the English Church. Danish ecclesiastics studied in Paris and elsewhere on the Continent—down to the Reformation, as a rule, the higher clergy in Denmark were trained abroad—but not in Oxford, and the great English schoolmen of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries did not exercise any direct influence in Denmark, if any at all; neither were the ideas of Wycliffe propagated in that country. The next landmark is the turning-point of the sixteenth century: the Reformation, although it caused a division of the two countries, reveals some points of unity in diversity by which the intercourse of modern times is rendered possible.

When we pass over to the Reformation epoch, it must be admitted at once that there was scarcely any intellectual or spiritual intercourse worth mentioning between the two nations at the time; but, however diverse in their character, the simultaneous religious movements were inter-related to some extent, that in Denmark being entirely due to the Lutheran revival, that in England being not entirely independent of it. The influence of Lutheranism upon the English Reformation in its first stage is pointed out by a learned Church historian of the seventeenth century, L. Seckendorf.<sup>1</sup> In his Bampton Lectures for 1804 Archbishop Laurence says: ‘On the whole [therefore] the principles upon which our Reformation was conducted ought not to remain in doubt: they were essentially Lutheran.’<sup>2</sup> Evidences are also given by several more recent historians such as Ranke, Froude, Blunt, and Dixon. During the sixteenth century over and over again the Anglicans were inclined to join the Lutherans in Germany.

‘In Henry VIII.’s time, in 1533, and again in 1535, overtures were made for a *Fœdus Evangelicum*, a league of the great reforming nations. The differences between the German and the English Protestants were at that time very great, not only in details of discipline and government, but in the general spirit

<sup>1</sup> *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutheranism* (1692, fol.) Lib. iii. sect. 13, xxxix.; sect. 17, lxvi.

<sup>2</sup> *An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical* (1805), p. 25.



in which the Reformation in the two countries was being conducted. But an alliance of the kind contemplated would perhaps have been carried out had it not been for the bigotry which insisted upon signature of the Augsburg Confession. Queen Elizabeth was at one time inclined to join on behalf of England the Smalcaldic League of German Protestants, but the same obstacle intervened.<sup>1</sup>

And *vice versa*, while they kept aloof from English Presbyterians, the Lutherans in Germany approached the Anglicans.

‘As between England and Germany, one great impediment to a cordial understanding arose out of the differences between Lutheran and Reformed. So long as the English Church was under the guidance of Cranmer and Ridley, it was not clear to which of these two parties it most nearly approximated. In the reign of Edward VI. the Calvinistic element gained ground—a tendency as much resented by the one party abroad as it was welcomed by the other. The English clergymen who found a refuge in the Swiss and German cities were treated with marked neglect by the Lutherans, but received with great hospitality by the Calvinists. At a later period, when Presbyterianism had for the time gained strong ground in England, the attitude had become somewhat reversed. The Reformed or Calvinist section of German Protestants sided chiefly with Presbyterians, the Lutherans with the English Churchmen.’<sup>2</sup>

This attitude of the Lutherans was very natural, as they really did steer a course approaching the *via media* of the English Church, in the Scandinavian countries even more than in Germany. It is true that at the time of the Reformation there was no corporate alliance between the Church of England and that of Denmark, but on neither side did any prejudice exist against associating one with the other, as is exemplified by the following instances. In the British Museum is found a copy of the ‘*Ordinantia Ecclesiastica Regnorum Daniae et Norwegiae, 1537*,’ dedicated to Henry VIII. by Bugenhagen<sup>3</sup>; we are hereby reminded of the well-

<sup>1</sup> Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, i. p. 367.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Kirkehistoriske Samlinger*, V. Series, vol. i. p. 335.

known fact that in the following year some Lutherans from Germany were invited to England by the King, in order to join the Anglican divines who had to draw up a confession of faith, the outcome being the Thirteen Articles of 1538. A young Danish scholar, Hans Oldendorph, was an amanuensis to Archbishop Cranmer, 1549-1550, and returned to his native country only because of a mental disease and dislike of the Calvinism then prevailing among the English Reformers.<sup>1</sup> Another member of the University of Copenhagen, Johan Spithoff (Johannes Spithovius), a German by birth, was tutor to Princess (afterwards Queen) Elizabeth.<sup>2</sup> The Scotchman, John MacAlpine, who had studied in England, became Professor of Divinity in the University of Copenhagen, here called Johannes Machabæus Alpinus;<sup>3</sup> and after having arrived in Copenhagen in 1555 his brother-in-law, Bishop Miles Coverdale, was offered preferment in Denmark which he declined only because he failed to master the Danish language, going thereafter to Germany and later returning to England.<sup>4</sup>

It is beyond all denial that the final Reformation settlement in England has a character of its own; but it is equally certain that Lutheranism is much more conservative than Calvinism, and the Churches of Scandinavia especially are possessed of a respect for tradition which has traits in common with the principles of reformed Catholicism as advocated by the Church of England. Without attempting to give an exhaustive account of resemblances and differences between the English and the Danish Churches, we think it worth while to point out the features of unity underlying the manifold diversity, and it may be convenient to group the details under the following three heads.

In the first place, there is an unquestionable analogy

<sup>1</sup> H. F. Rördam, *Kjöbenhavns Universitets Historie*, 1537-1621, vol. i. p. 600.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 599 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 587 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 593 sq. The literary product of his stay on the Continent was: *The Order of the Church of Denmark, and in many Places of Germany, for the Lord's Supper, Baptism, and Holy Wedlock*, in *Writings and Translations of Myles Coverdale*, ed. by G. Pearson (Parker Society), pp. 467 ff.

between the two Churches as viewed under a doctrinal aspect, the connecting link being the Thirteen Articles of 1538, through which as a medium the Augsburg Confession influenced the Thirty-two Articles from which the Thirty-nine are descended. The matter has been expounded in his Bampton Lectures by Archbishop Laurence and in all elaborate commentaries on the Articles which have seen the light since, such as those by Hardwick and Dr. Gibson, now Bishop of Gloucester. In some passages the similarity is obvious, but, as Dr. Gibson has it, the debt of the Articles to Lutheranism is but a limited one.

‘On the burning question of justification’ (says the Bishop), ‘and all kindred subjects, where correspondence might well be looked for, it is remarkable that it is sought in vain. On all these topics, which were among the principal subjects of debate in the early days of the Reformation—questions which concern the condition of man, and the means of his salvation—our reformers took an independent line of their own, which differs in a very marked way from the line taken at Augsburg. Nor should it be forgotten that in some of the matters in which indebtedness to the Lutheran formulary cannot be denied, the Anglican statements are far stronger and more precise than those to which the Lutherans were called on to subscribe.’<sup>1</sup>

We should hesitate to say anything in the way of criticism against what the Bishop has alleged on the relations of the two documents, although we are not certain that full justice is done to the Augsburg Confession; but, when full allowance is made for the undeniable differences, we should, on the other hand, be no less indisposed to emphasize these at the sacrifice of the underlying correspondence. In support of our proposition we only suggest a comparison between the two formularies on one side and the Calvinistic confessions on the other. It would seem to us that over against the latter there is an essential accordance between the former, and we think this holds good especially in the doctrine of the sacraments. In contradistinction to the ‘reformed’ confessions the two formularies belong to the same doctrinal type, the differences being but varying

<sup>1</sup> Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 26 sq.



shades of the same tenets or even, in some cases, the merest shadows of shades.

Secondly, as regards the liturgy and ritual there is no discrepancy in principle between the two Churches. The very fact that the compilers of the English Prayer-Book made use of Lutheran orders of service goes to indicate an historical connexion in this respect no less interesting than that in doctrine. Certainly, the service of the Danish Church is very poor in comparison with the rich liturgy of the English Church, but here also the contrast with the service of the 'reformed' Churches is very suggestive. Fundamentally the Lutheran order of service is more divergent from the Calvinistic than from the Anglican ideal. While the Calvinists have cast away all usages which are not expressly sanctioned by Scripture, the Lutherans as well as the Anglicans have retained later practices so far as they are not incompatible with primitive Christianity. The difference between the Church of England and that of Denmark in ritual is only one of degree, not of principle. English churchmen travelling in Denmark usually find the service of the national Church nearer related to the Anglican forms than they expected it to be. We may refer here to the testimonies of two English clergymen who have visited that country. One of them says :

' Many of the English people who now resort to Scandinavia in the summer must be struck, when they first spend a Sunday there, with what they find in the native churches. They see crucifixes and elaborate reredoses—often dating from the Middle Ages, and "idolatrous" beyond anything that St. Paul's has ever been accused of ; they see the vestments worn, candles lighted, wafers used. The service is called by the name of " High Mass," the officiating minister the " priest." He sings the office to regular (though not Gregorian) modes ; he absolves each intending communicant singly before the service begins with imposition of hands ; he blesses the people with the sign of the cross. When service is over he departs through the streets in his comely cassock, with its picturesque sixteenth-century ruff.' <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *C.Q.R.* April 1891, p. 149 *sq.*

Dr. A. J. Mason, after a second visit to Denmark, recorded one of his experiences in the following words :

‘ Last year, by permission of the venerable Bishop of Aarhus, I celebrated the Holy Eucharist for an English congregation at the magnificent high altar of Aarhus Cathedral, in the ancient ecclesiastical vesture which is still retained there, and with their own beautiful sacred vessels. I long for the day when it may be possible for these exceptional courtesies to pass into the fulness of fraternal communion.’<sup>1</sup>

Another English churchman, the Rev. G. C. Richards, of Oriol College, thus states his very similar impressions :

‘ To those who think of Lutheranism as very “ Protestant ” it will be surprising to learn that Scandinavia is distinctly ritualistic. Its churches use four of the “ six points.” Incense and the mixed chalice are not found, but the eastward position, altar-lights, and wafer-breads are invariable. As a rule the officiating clergyman wears simply cassock and bands, but on festivals he celebrates with the chasuble over the surplice. . . . According to the Danish ritual law of 1688 the priest is ordered to wear every Sunday at High Mass the surplice and chasuble, and to remove the latter only when preaching. The crucifix has always been in common use in Denmark, though apparently not in Norway. . . . The sign of the cross is freely used, especially in giving the Benediction.’<sup>2</sup>

Observations like these serve to shew that the service of the Danish Church is akin to that of the Church of England. It might be urged that many individual members or even large sections of the Danish Church lay very little stress upon the ceremonies taken over from the Middle Ages or even regard some of them as obnoxious ; but, on the other hand, the desire has sometimes been expressed for an enrichment of the service by adoption of more usages from the ancient liturgies.

As a correlative to the mention of the Danish service made by English clergymen might be quoted an utterance about the English liturgy by the present Bishop of Sea-

<sup>1</sup> *The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity* (Longmans, 1896), p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *The Guardian*, August 14, 1901. We have slightly abridged the passage quoted, but altered no words.

land, Dr. T. Skat Rördam, who in 1857 made a long stay in London to study Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum. Speaking of that visit to England, in a discussion on Prayers at a Church Congress in Copenhagen, in 1890, Dr. Rördam expressed himself in the following terms :

‘ I have seldom heard more tiresome sermons than there, mostly in the Established Church, long-winded, arguing lectures that were recited from the book. And yet, I think I hardly remember one single occasion when I left the service without having derived edification and blessing from it, just owing to the common prayers that were prescribed in the Liturgy, but in which the congregation, on the whole, heartily joined. What not least contributed toward this was that one knew what was the object of the prayer, especially when one knew in some measure these prayers by heart ; they are pretty easily learnt. On the other hand, among the Dissenters, where the preaching generally was far more animated, I heard the most deterring examples of prayers offered *ex tempore* by the ministers.’<sup>1</sup>

Thirdly, we also find in the constitution of the Danish Church some points of contact with that of the Church of England. What has been said of the conservative spirit of Lutheranism proves true here too. The Churches of Scandinavia, as the correspondent of the *Guardian* admirably puts it, ‘ have never entirely lost the sense of historic continuity.’ From Lutheran principles no argument can be derived against episcopacy, even though against its divine right. Luther would not have opposed the bishops if they had been ‘ veri episcopi.’<sup>2</sup> That, perhaps, may be brought to bear upon the Reformation in Denmark. While then the mass of the priests submitted to the new order of things and became ministers in the ‘ Evangelical Lutheran ’ Church, the bishops opposed the King, Christian III., and were ‘ pinioned,’ to quote the word used by himself. In this way the episcopal succession was discontinued in Denmark.<sup>3</sup> A new Episcopacy was afterwards introduced,

<sup>1</sup> *Beretning om det fjerde kirkelige Møde 14-16 October 1890 i Kjöbenhavn*, p. 101 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Art. Smalcald*, x. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See the article ‘ The Loss of the Succession in Denmark,’ *C.Q.R.* April 1891, quoted above.



but neither then nor at any time later has it been considered requisite to restore the continuity. In acknowledging the Episcopate of Sweden and Denmark Bishop Bramhall most likely was not aware of the breach of the succession in the latter country; <sup>1</sup> while further, we may add what Dr. Mason says of the former: 'The Swedish Church has a personal succession of bishops, though theologically it may be doubted whether the formula used in the consecration is sufficient for the purpose.' <sup>2</sup> Yet the Danish Church has always maintained its Catholicity. The Reformation in Denmark was not the foundation of a new Church, but a readjustment of the national Church founded by the mission of Ansgar. The Danish Church claims to be a branch of the Catholic Church, having preserved its continuity as an organized society. And there can be little or no doubt that with its old dioceses and parishes, its two orders (of bishop and priest), its convocations and other ecclesiastical institutions, it is more closely related to the Church of England than to English Nonconformity.

If the analogies between the two Churches are so great it remains to consider the possibilities of a mutual intercourse in our own day. But when at present an inquiry arises about a closer union, a retrospective glance would seem to be appropriate, and therefore, before entering upon the question, we shall premise a short historical survey. During the intervening centuries the two Churches have been but rarely, and on a very small scale, in touch with one another; yet history shews that there has been a growing English influence upon the Church life in Denmark.

It has been mentioned that Queen Elizabeth contemplated an alliance with the Smalcaldic League, but was frustrated by the requirement of the signature of the Augsburg Confession. On the part of England the Subscription Act of 1571 was likely to be an obstacle to approaches of Lutherans. Otherwise, the differences between Anglicanism and Lutheranism were not very conspicuous. The views of most of the Elizabethan bishops seem to have

<sup>1</sup> *Typical Churchmen*, ed. by W. E. Collins, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> *The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, p. 133.

been distinctly Protestant<sup>1</sup>; the school which in the seventeenth century was to give full shape to the Anglican principles in their individual character was only beginning to make its influence felt.

During the reign of the Stuarts England had political relations with Denmark, and in that respect it was of no little consequence that King James I. was married to a Danish princess. It goes far to indicate a close friendship between the sovereigns of the two countries that Charles I. commissioned two Scots to visit the King of Denmark to urge him to send arms for 12,000 men, 24 cannon, 100,000*l.*, a fleet of ships of war, 3,000 German infantry and 1,000 horse.<sup>2</sup> But there was no intellectual intercourse at the time, or next to none. It was not till the reign of William III. that English thought began to influence the Danish literature, even though we meet with some few Danish students in Oxford already in the closing years of the Stuart times. When, in 1792, the young Professor of History in the University of Copenhagen, Frederik Sneedorff, was travelling in England, where he was killed by an accident near Manchester, he copied from the register of visitors of the Bodleian Library a list of more than eighty Danes (including Norwegians) who between 1682 and 1783 had had access to the Library.<sup>3</sup> Several of them in their after-lives became distinguished men, the most famous being Ludvig Holberg, dramatist, historian, and philosopher, the greatest of all Danish writers, who studied in England, chiefly in London and Oxford, 1706-1708, and was deeply imbued with the common sense of the English mind. All through the eighteenth century English philosophy and theology acted upon the religious thought in Denmark, and English works of fiction and poetry were translated or imitated.<sup>4</sup> Of those currents of ideas that

<sup>1</sup> See F. O. White, *Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops* (Skeffington & Son, 1898).

<sup>2</sup> Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, vol. i. p. 45.

<sup>3</sup> Frederik Sneedorff, *Samlede Skrifter*, vol. i. p. 521 *sq.*

<sup>4</sup> See Adolf Hansen, *Engelsk Indflydelse paa dansk Aandsliv og Literatur i det attende Aarhundrede*, Dansk Tidsskrift, 1906.

flowed into the general Danish literature a good deal might be said, but these need not detain us here, as we are only concerned with the relations of the Churches. But simultaneously with the philosophic and literary impulses from beyond the North Sea began that infusion of the religious zeal of the British race which constitutes one of the main characteristics of Danish Church life in our own day.

The Lutheran influence in England was strengthened by the marriage of Queen Anne with Prince George of Denmark; and the accession of the House of Hanover was followed by an active co-operation of English clergymen and Lutheran pastors in London. At that time the English Church evinced a strong tendency towards a union with the Protestant bodies on the Continent, a tendency that originated from the principles of the English Reformation, as we have seen already.

‘From the very beginning of the Reformation it had been a vexed question how far the cause of the Reformed Church of England could be identified with that of other communions which had cast off the yoke of Rome. In dealing with this problem, a broad distinction had generally been made between Nonconformists at home and Protestant communities abroad. The relation of the English Church to Nonconformity may accordingly be considered separately. So long as it was a question of communion, more or less intimate, with foreign Churches, the intercourse was at all events not embarrassed with any difficulties about schism.’<sup>1</sup>

The prime mover in the endeavour for a closer union between the English Church and the Protestants on the Continent was Archbishop Wake.

‘He desired to be on terms of cordial friendship with the Reformed Churches, notwithstanding their points of difference from that of England. He would wish they had a moderate episcopal government, according to the primitive model; nor did he yet despair of it, if not in his own time, perhaps in the days to come. He would welcome a closer union among all the Reformed bodies, at almost any price. The advantages he anticipated from such a result would be immense. Any

<sup>1</sup> Abbey and Overton, *op. cit.* p. 365.

approximations in Church government and Church offices which might conduce to it he should indeed rejoice in.' <sup>1</sup>

According to these views an Englishman who was not in his own day considered a Latitudinarian was of the opinion that members of the Church of Denmark would have no right to separate from their fellow-members on the plea that they liked the ways of the Church of England better.<sup>2</sup> It seems that Archbishop Wake corresponded with leading men of the Danish Church.<sup>3</sup> The S.P.C.K. supported the Danish mission in India, and on this matter, at least, letters are found among the Archbishop's papers. There was at the time no inconsiderable conflux of the religious life of England and Germany through the Lutherans and Moravians in London, and A. H. Franke in Halle was the intermediate link between the S.P.C.K. and the Danish 'Missions-Collegium,' which had the supervision of the missions. Philip Jacob Spener, the originator of the German Pietism, was deeply impressed in his youth by English devotional literature; in Denmark, as in Germany, such books were translated, but in both countries indiscriminately dissenting rather than Anglican productions. As the counterpart to this may be recalled the fact that John Wesley at the turning-point of his life received a very powerful impulse from Luther's exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.

During the nineteenth century there has been an ever increasing communication between England and Denmark. The commercial intercourse is of vital importance to either country, and in science, philosophy, and general literature the English influence is now very considerable in Denmark. At the same time the religious life in that country is affected by the impetus of English revivalism. Not a few clergymen and ordination candidates have gone to London in order to make themselves acquainted with the methods of mission work and charities. The Danish Bible Society, Missionary Society, Young Men's Christian Association, and

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 355.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 366.

<sup>3</sup> Abbey, *The English Church and its Bishops*, 1700-1800, i. 98.



numerous other Christian efforts are organized and conducted more or less on the same lines as their English models. The book market is inundated by translations of English devotional books and religious tracts—again, as in the eighteenth century, the works of dissenting rather than of Anglican writers.

The same influence is conspicuous in the Protestant Churches in Germany; but the Danish soil seems to be particularly fitting for the English growths. Although the English sway has been of an excessively one-sided character, yet tendencies corresponding to those of the various sections of the English Church are, perhaps, more pronounced in Denmark than in any other country. Even the designations 'high,' 'low,' and 'broad' Church have of late come into frequent use in Denmark as hardly anywhere else outside England. It must, however, be noticed that the diverse currents are sometimes intermingled in a curious way so as to render an attempt to place the English and Danish Church parties side by side rather precarious.

Two parties have originated in the revival of the nineteenth century. The older are the Grundtvigianers, so called after N. F. S. Grundtvig (b. 1783, d. 1872). He was a seer: his views were the intuitions and visions of a prophet. They sprang out of his personal experience, but were deeply tinged with the Romanticism of the age. As a preacher and a poet, an historian and a politician, a champion for national freedom and the founder of rural High Schools, he originated a movement which has been of very great significance in the development of the religious and national life in Denmark. The tendency is not purely religious, but patriotic and political as well. The Grundtvigianers look upon Christianity from an historico-poetical standpoint and aim at promoting everything which is truly humane; their view of life is bright and broad. Grundtvig's love of ecclesiastical antiquity led him into the study of ancient Church history and Old Northern literature. He was an admirer of the Anglo-Saxon poetry and translated *Beowulf* into Danish. He made four trips to England (1829, 1830, 1831, and 1843), and was for a while attracted by the

English Church ; but it is perfectly clear that, whatever else England gave Grundtvig, it did not give him any deep and lasting sympathy with Anglican views. He had indeed some very pronounced sacramental views and thought highly of the primitive tradition ; the centre of his teaching was his ' marvellous discovery,' as he called it, that the Creed is a word of the Lord Himself handed over from the Apostles to posterity. His followers sometimes call themselves ' the Church party ' ( ' den kirkelige Retning ' ), which means ' the High Church party,' if it means anything. But, excepting the sacramental views, there is in the theology of Grundtvig and his school not the slightest tendency to High Church doctrine. In regard to Church offices and Holy Orders their views are distinctly Low ; as to Church government their standpoint is the reverse of that commonly described as High Church. Being a democrat to the backbone, Grundtvig called the National Church ' a civil institution ' ( ' en verdslig Indretning ' ) which ought to embrace all religious denominations. Although this ecclesiastico-political view may remind one of Dr. Arnold's ' Principles of Church Reform,' it must be borne in mind that Grundtvig reached his conclusions from a somewhat different starting-point. In the first stage of its development Grundtvigianism met with very strong opposition, and, in order to ensure his own followers full liberty within the national Church, Grundtvig laid claim to full freedom for all parties alike. He advocated what he called ' Præstefrihed,' *i.e.* the pastors' liberty of preaching and administering the sacraments according to their own discretion. He was more inspired by English Nonconformity than by Anglicanism. A very suggestive characteristic of Grundtvigianism is the ' Elective Communities Act ' of 1868, according to which a number of twenty persons, being the heads of a household, can form an elective community, building their own church and electing their own pastor, and yet being acknowledged as belonging to the Established Church. As there was in the party a tendency to separation in order to gain outside the pale of the Establishment the liberty they desired, the Act aims at being a safety-valve against disruption, and as such

it has been working well. Grundtvig's view of Church government has been discarded by many of his followers, but is still retained by others and even among the moderate men persists in a mitigated form. For the present there is a very marked difference between two currents, one of them tending to co-operation with the conservative party, the other to an extreme democratism.

The other section, of more recent origin, the 'Indre Mission' (Home Mission), was, as the name implies, originally intended to do a work, not to be a party; but they represent a very distinct tendency in Danish Church life. The movement is deeply indebted to the philosopher Søren Kierkegaard (b. 1813, d. 1855), a great dialectician and brilliant writer, but above all a profound religious thinker whose significance for the 'Indre Mission' has been a similar one to that of Alexandre Vinet for the 'Réveil' in Switzerland and France. But the one man who was its originator and moving force was Pastor Vilhelm Beck (b. 1829, d. 1901), a vigorous preacher and a man of great organizing powers. He travelled much in Denmark, preaching everywhere, and sent out lay preachers; throughout the country meeting-houses were built. The revival caused by Beck and his co-workers in some respects reminds one of the Methodist movement; but from the beginning it had a distinctly national character. Its adherents were conservative in doctrine and faithful to the principles of the national Church, words which will still apply to the older generation. The tendency had its roots in the pietism of the preceding ages, and, as the name was taken over from Germany, it has been largely affected by the evangelistic work in that country. But of late years many of the younger men have been instinct with the spirit of English and American revivalism. Such preachers as C. H. Spurgeon, Hugh Price Hughes, and Mr. F. B. Meyer have strongly appealed to those of them who have visited London. The Keswick movement has found a ready response among Danish students. Although the party generally hold fast to the doctrine of the Church, they sometimes shew a certain drift towards undenominationalism,

joining themselves freely with Evangelicals and Nonconformists alike.

The third section includes the rest of the Danish Church people. They are the conservatives, nowadays often called the 'High Church' party.<sup>1</sup> Comparatively they are 'High,' in so far as they maintain the principles and traditions of the national Church; but they have no leanings to distinct High Church views as advocated within the Church of England. They have much in common with orthodox Broad churchmen in England. They leave a wide scope for the free display of individualities, and thus we find within their ranks a variety of types of personalities and theological thinkers. A fairly good idea of the main characteristics of the school may be derived from the writings of the late Bishop of Sealand, Dr. H. L. Martensen (b. 1808, d. 1884), the friend and correspondent of J. A. Dorner. With a brilliant speculative power he endeavours to mediate between opposing extremes and to combine the interests of practical Church work with the pursuits of scientific theology. New currents of thought have set in, more realistic methods have sprung up, but the general character of the school, which has often been called after Martensen, is unchanged. Among them we are sure to find most of the men who appreciate learning, are interested in theological studies, and have a mind for literary culture and refinement. They have of late years frequently been characterized as the 'third' party as an indication of their being outsiders, belonging to neither of the two dominant parties; but having been compelled by these to organize themselves they have assumed the name of 'the centre.'

At one period (1848-1870) the Grundtvigianers had the ascendancy, while in the following one the 'Indre Mission' has been predominant,<sup>2</sup> and the two parties have been so powerful as to throw the 'third' party into the shade. Grundtvigianism has leavened large sections of

<sup>1</sup> So also in the charming little book *Danish Life in Town and Country*, by Mrs. Jessie Bröchner (George Newnes), p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> L. Koch, *Fra Grundtvigianismens og den Indre Missions Tid 1848-1898* (Copenhagen, 1898).



the Church by overlapping to a certain extent the other tendencies and creating a wide-spread 'Half-Grundtvigianism.'<sup>1</sup> But if it must be admitted that the conservative party for two generations have been eclipsed by the combined forces of a twofold revival, it should not be forgotten that the background is the natural place for the section which is, after all, the backbone of the Church.

The present Church Reform movements in England and Denmark have shewn emphatically the deep-rooted differences between the two national Churches; but through the intricacies of conflicting opinions are faintly seen some parallel lines which betray the underlying analogies.

Until 1849 the Danish Church was absolutely governed by the State, but in that year King Frederic VII. signed a constitution, the 'Ground Law,' which was revised in 1866, and according to which the legislative rule is exercised conjointly by the King and the Parliament (the 'Rigsdag') consisting of an Upper House (the 'Landsting') and a Lower House (the 'Folkething'). The 'Ground Law' marks a new departure in the history of the Danish Church. We may quote the principal paragraphs regarding the relations of Church and State: 'The Evangelical-Lutheran Church is the Danish National Church (Folkekirke) and is aided as such by the State.' 'The Constitution of the National Church shall be regulated by law.' The Church was to be governed by the Rigsdag only until it had got a constitution of its own; yet the promise contained in the latter paragraph has not been fulfilled till now. The work of a commission appointed in 1853 in order to prepare a constitution came to nothing, and a second one in 1868 had no better success. Several reforms were carried through by Acts of Parliament, *e.g.* a law on Release of the obligation of parishioners to use their own pastor, 1855, and the Elective Communities Act, 1868; but the Church is still governed by a minister and a parliament who are not bound to belong to it. For the present a new attempt is being made, and there is some prospect of the object being achieved. In

<sup>1</sup> C. H. Scharling, *Halvgrundtvigianismen eller Bogstavdyrkelsen* (Copenhagen, 1893).

July 1901 the first Liberal government was formed, and the new minister of ecclesiastical affairs and public education, Mr. J. C. Christensen (since 1904 premier), was anxious to ensure the fulfilment of the promise of the Ground Law. In 1903 three Bills were passed and sanctioned by the King, all of them being stepping-stones to the constitution to come.

The first of these laws enacted the formation of parochial church councils. The preceding debate in and outside the Houses of the Rigsdag presented an interesting parallel to the Church Reform movement which has been going on in England. It mainly turned upon the question of the lay franchise and the eligibility of laymen. How were the laity to be represented? Who were to be considered to be qualified to exercise a suffrage and to be eligible? Should baptism alone or confirmation or communion be the test? Should a declaration of being *bona fide* members of the Church be sufficient? Should women have a vote? What should be the office of the councils? By the law of 1903 parish councils were, by way of experiment, formed in all parishes for a period of six years, consisting of the pastor as chairman and at least four other members elected in the following way. Electors and eligible are men and women belonging to the parish, of the age of twenty-five and upwards, so far as they have not been convicted of any offence considered ignominious by public opinion, or led a scandalous life; besides this they have to ask that their names should be entered upon the roll of electors by filling up a form and signing a declaration, confessing thereby that they are baptized and members of the national Church and intend to retain their rights and duties as such. The councils are to have the control of several matters concerning the parish and its church. Of vital importance is the provision that, when a benefice is vacant, the council may be consulted on the appointment of a new pastor; since the law came into operation, the councils have usually been consulted, and they have very largely influenced the nomination of pastors.

The second law enacted the formation of a committee ('et kirkeligt Udvalg') to frame a constitution for the Church. It numbers thirty-seven members: four nominated by the

'Church minister'; the Bishop of Sealand; three other bishops chosen by the bishops as a body; eight pastors, one from Copenhagen elected by its clergy, seven elected by the clergy outside the capital; one professor of divinity and one professor of law selected by their respective faculties; eighteen laymen or women, three from Copenhagen, seven from the Isles, eight from Jutland; one member for the Færøer. Among the members there is one woman, a pastor's wife. The lay members are elected by representatives of the parish councils, according to the rules of proportional numbers.

The third law, 'On the Use of Churches,' supplements the Elective Communities Law by enacting that a number of not less than ten persons, being the heads of a household and belonging to the Church, shall have a right to use the parish church, at times when it is not used otherwise, for public services held by any pastor belonging to the Church. By this law the elective communities are relieved from the obligation to provide a church of their own.

The committee, who met for the first time in May 1904, have debated a great many questions of minor reforms, and in 1906 a sub-committee submitted a draft of a constitution. The final wording was adopted on October 31, 1906, by twenty-four votes to nine, and the Bill has been sent to the 'Church minister,' who is expected to introduce it in the Folkething next autumn. The time is not come to dilate on the scheme; we shall only make a few general remarks which will serve to lead us to a brief concluding survey of the question of the future relations of the two Churches.

No one who has followed the Church Reform movements in England and Denmark in our day can fail to see some points of contact despite the striking contrast. If it be asked, then, what are the main characteristics of the reform scheme now being discussed in Denmark, it is true, we must reply that they cannot easily be reduced to a short formula; but some questions stand out among numerous minor ones; such are those of parochial church councils; a representative church council; the election of bishops and pastors; and the clerical subscription. The discussion of these and other important matters has not infrequently offered very

interesting parallels to the opinions propounded in the English Church. While the Protestant communions on the Continent generally are divided into two parties, an 'orthodox' one and a 'liberal' one, in Denmark three tendencies are discernible, to a certain extent corresponding to the 'high, low and broad' Church views in England. The parties are not so marked as in England, and their interests are often strangely intercrossed; but still the divisions within the Church Committee unmistakeably point to those conflicting principles. Again, while in purely Presbyterian churches the questions of their government and discipline turn on the relations of pastors and congregations, the committee now at work in Denmark have to define also the power of the bishops and the way in which they are to be elected. Here is a point of intersection where the English and Danish Churches meet, but only to diverge again. The crucial question of apostolical succession reveals a difference which, dating from the Reformation, depends upon incompatible principles.

The fundamental difference between the two Churches is perfectly clear and conclusive for the attitude of either. The position of the one is thus stated by Dr. Mason: 'If the English Church in her corporate capacity were to enter into full communion with the Presbyterian Churches, it would not only cause disruption within the English Church itself, it would bar the way to any reunion with the as yet unreformed Churches of Christendom. The cost would be too great.'<sup>1</sup> As regards the other, its rule was laid down when the late Bishop of Sealand, Dr. H. L. Martensen, opposed the design of the newly appointed Bishop of Iceland, who had besought the King to allow him to seek consecration from the English bishops<sup>2</sup>; for it should not be overlooked that the line taken by Dr. Martensen did express the position of the Danish Church, and there cannot be the slightest doubt that any Danish bishop in our own day would act on the same principle.

<sup>1</sup> *Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> See *C.Q.R.* April 1891, p. 187. Mason, *Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, pp. 133, 134.



Now, when the question arises of the relations between the two Churches in future, the answer must be, then, that the doctrine of apostolical succession is a barrier to a full intercommunion. For the present they have to agree to differ. But if a corporate union and co-operation under the existing conditions is impossible, there seems to be every reason to believe that a friendly intercourse between individual members, or even sections, of the two Churches would be possible and practicable. As Dr. Mason has said : ' They [the Danes] are more like English people in the make of their minds than any other people in the world.'<sup>1</sup> And if the views propounded in this article are borne out by a sound interpretation of facts and documents, there are fundamental analogies between the doctrinal standards and ecclesiastical systems of Anglicanism and Lutheranism. It is a suggestive fact that many Danes who have established themselves in England have joined the Anglican Church and feel at home in it. Again, that an interchange of ideas is attainable would seem to be indicated by the actual state of things. The Westcotts and the Lightfoots are well known to Greek scholars in Denmark, and not less the teachers upon whose shoulders their mantles have fallen ; the ideas of the *Lux Mundi* school and other currents in English theology have attracted the attention of students of divinity, since, on the whole, an increasing number of Danish students are desirous of learning from all kinds of English thinkers. Correspondingly, the interest taken by English people in Danish affairs has been rapidly growing ; and the mention made of the Danish Church by Anglican writers, as quoted above, may be regarded as an omen indicating that it will not be ignored in England in future. At present there are but few on either side who realize the unquestionable analogies between the Church of England and that of Denmark ; but we cannot help thinking that an extended intercourse and a fuller interchange of theological thought would serve to pave the way for a closer union and co-operation in a better day to come.

C. E. FLÖYSTRUP.

<sup>1</sup> Mason, *op. cit.* p. 132.

# ART. V.—PALLADIUS AND EGYPTIAN MONASTICISM.

1. *The Lausiack History of Palladius.* 'Cambridge Texts and Studies,' vi. 1, 2. Edited by Dom E. C. BUTLER. (Cambridge University Press : 1904.)
2. *Palladius und Rufinus.* By E. PREUSCHEN. (Giessen, 1897.)
3. *Das Morgenländische Mönchtum.* By S. SCHIWIEZ. Vol. I. (Mainz, 1904.)
4. *Étude sur le Cénobitisme Pachomien.* By P. LADEUZE. (Louvain, 1898.)
5. *Das Mönchtum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte.* By A. HARNACK. 6th edition. (Giessen, 1903.)

A LIVELY interest has been awakened of late in the early history of monasticism. In the main, no doubt, the cause has been the manifest importance and vitality of the institution in more communions than one, but there has been also the curiosity, less honourable in its origin, excited by certain attempts to cast discredit upon the traditional story. A German scholar named Weingarten, animated by the prevalent spirit of doubt, absolutely denied its authenticity some thirty years ago, and was followed by the equally peremptory Dr. Lucius; while a distinguished Coptic scholar of France, M. Amélineau, has combined an equal destructiveness with a pleasure, such as is sometimes regarded as characteristic of his countrymen, in insinuating on the flimsiest of evidence charges against the morality of the Egyptian monks. The latter accusation is easily refuted, while the general attack upon the credibility of the history has provoked a crushing retort. Step by step the ground has been regained; the legendary aspect of many of the early narratives has been shewn to prove rather that the authors shared the superstitions of their age and country than that they were wilful romancers, and that the strange atmosphere in which their characters move is itself a witness to the fact that these are sincere and contemporaneous records of what they believed they saw.

But the final and triumphant demonstration has been the work of patient and exact scholars. It was, above all things, necessary that two documents, the *Lausiack History of Palladius* and the anonymous *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, should be accurately edited and analyzed. This being done, the earlier and later history of the institution would become intelligible, for these records tell of the lives and the methods of monks who themselves laid the foundations of organized asceticism and were almost contemporaries of the first adventurers upon this path. The latter and somewhat less important, though not less interesting, of the two treatises, has been admirably edited by Dr Erwin Preuschen in his *Palladius und Rufinus*; the former, which is the primary authority, has been rescued from confusion and interpolation by the labours of Dom Cuthbert Butler, who has now been raised to the high office of Abbot of Downside, and whose edition of the *Lausiack History* may rank with the best work of his Order in the eighteenth century.

The works thus presented in their true form are thoroughly representative of the whole literature of early monasticism. They are anecdotic and discursive, interested in persons rather than institutions or principles. Nor can the writers be commended as having attempted to give a comprehensive and dispassionate survey of what they saw and heard. Eccentric acts and epigrammatic sayings clung to their memories, and their vision was of high lights and deep shadows. We must read between the lines if we are to understand the average life and spirit of the Egyptian monk in hermitage or convent. But there is a further need for effort and caution on the part of the student. The simple sincerity of such a writer as Palladius is as obvious as the difference between his outlook upon life and that of Herodotus. Yet both were making pilgrimages in search, among other things, of religious information along the banks of the Nile, and the industry of both was rewarded with a harvest of wonderful stories. There had been no change in the standard of probability or of truthfulness among the devotees of two very different faiths, and in our

moral judgement we must make due and ample allowance for the incapacity of the race, or perhaps of the class. The undoubted sincerity of the Egyptian monks, displayed in the whole tenour of their life, did not train their mind to appreciate truthfulness for its own sake. They had a dual existence: one life rigidly conversant with practical and theological realities, and another wandering at will in the fields of romance. This must be borne in mind if we are to do justice to these pioneers of monasticism, but it is even more necessary for the student of Herodotus to remember that the Egyptian mind, when trained to contemplation, could simultaneously and comfortably contain both a profound system of thought concerning the unseen world and an unlimited stock of frivolous stories. The intellectual continuity is not broken by the fact that in the pure air of Christianity the stories, while equally astonishing with those of the older time, have grown to be often edifying and always eminently respectable. They do not, it is needless to say, form the staple of the narratives with which we are dealing, nor, indeed, are they in extent a considerable proportion of the whole. But they constantly intrude upon us, and from them we derive no small part of the entertainment which this literature undoubtedly conveys: an entertainment which is akin, however distantly, to that with which Herodotus has delighted so many generations. We need only to be on our guard lest we confuse the hero-worshippers with the heroes, or attach an excessive importance to the unreal when the reality presents itself with vivid and obvious truthfulness. Of no body of earnest Christians in any age can we form a picture more accurate and minute than of the Egyptian monks in their prime. Their merits and the faults which were often the exaggeration of their merits, their deep spirituality and its sometimes naïve expression, their efforts after Christian perfection, not least sincere when they were violent or grotesque, their very human sententiousness and sense of superiority, are all depicted by Palladius and their other admirers with a direct simplicity which is as effective as the most consummate art. Their literary method, by a fortunate



coincidence, is exactly suited to their material, and a reader familiar with the decadent classicism of too much patristic literature feels a glad relief when he turns to this happy and natural portraiture.

Egypt was the natural soil from which such a growth should spring. It has been usual, and in the text-books of the Roman Church the assertion is still made, to connect monasticism in the strict sense with that severity of life which from the first was common among serious Christians. We may read in quite recent works how the four daughters of Philip were forerunners of the nuns of later days, and so with the vowed virgins of whom we read from Tertullian onward. But theirs was a life in the world, and their danger came from association with it, and their glory from overcoming its temptations. St. Cyprian only bade them be sober in their bearing and their dress—it is not, indeed, till the time of St. Ambrose that we hear of a characteristic apparel—and contemplates neither solitude nor association as possible for them. But in the days of St. Athanasius there were in Alexandria houses of virgins, though we must regard these as substitutes for the home and places where the home life was lived. In fact, the monastic life for women was first suggested by its proved success in the case of men. It is not, then, in a primitive pursuit of perfection that we are to seek for the origin of the system; still less was it suggested by the need felt by preachers of the Gospel for freedom from the world's encumbrances. It came into existence at an ascertained point of time in the third century, and its novelty no doubt had much to do with the enthusiasm that greeted it.

Nor can we connect it with earlier and non-Christian phenomena which in some ways resembled it. The suggestion has been made, and for a while found a certain acceptance, that there were monks of Sarapis. But Preuschen has demonstrated that his votaries had nothing in common with the monks, and the one point which seemed decisively to favour the hypothesis, the assertion that the great Pachomius before his conversion was himself a priest of Sarapis, has been finally disproved by Ladeuze. The

famous 'Therapeutae' of whom we learn from Philo (if, as is probable, he is the author of the *De Vita contemplativa*) are more to the point; but here, again, it is impossible to demonstrate a connexion, and there is a broad interval of time between the days of Claudius and those of Decius. Nor was a spiritual impulse likely to spread from the alien Greek city which stood on Egyptian soil to the indigenous peasantry of Coptic speech, whose one contribution to the movement of the world has been the zeal with which they adopted this new method of Christian devotion. In fact, the pioneers seem to have been free from any infusion of Greek learning. Pachomius did not acquire the language till he was an abbot; St. Anthony, a peasant proprietor, probably never spoke it; many monks of the same class could not even read their native tongue—as, for instance, that Paphnutius surnamed Cephalas, who could interpret all Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament by what Palladius regarded as a prophetic gift, though the written page had no meaning for him.

A more probable origin has often been assigned in the Decian persecution. It is certain that in the year 250 many endangered Christians fled into the desert; but it is more than likely that their purpose was to return to their homes so soon as the storm had blown over. Still there is reason to believe that at least one refugee grew enamoured of a solitary life. Paul of Thebes at the age of sixteen is said to have escaped denunciation by a flight which led him through the rocky ranges which border the Nile Valley and far across the desert to a point which few of his successors were to reach, almost on the verge of the Red Sea. There he was truly a solitary, in his little cave by his spring and his date-palm: a hermit, or denizen of the desert, in the strictest sense, and the first to whom we can with certainty apply the famous name of 'Monk.' For a word which had hitherto been simply an adjective, appearing first in literature in the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, was now seized for Christian use. The new life needed a new name. For ninety years, it is said, Paul lived alone in austerity and meditation, and the knowledge of his

lonely struggle must have raised in many minds the thought that they, too, in some humbler way, might well enter upon the same conflict. Twenty years after Paul had vanished into the desert a more famous man, the Antony whom Athanasius has immortalized, took his first step in the same direction. At first he lingered, as we shall see that many less aspiring souls were to do, on the edges of civilization, but at the age of thirty-five, about the year 285, he, too, made his plunge, and made it with a definite ideal formed in his mind. Loneliness and austerity were to be but means to an end, and that end perfection. Paul had been in advance of his age; Antony caught the imagination of the day. Gradually disciples followed him to his retreat in the same region where Paul was already settled. In a loose way they attached themselves to their master, who made no attempt to organize their life or guide their thoughts. But so distant a region could not become the focus of a great movement. In regions not less inhospitable but nearer to the life of Egypt, the Nitrian and Scetic deserts, enthusiasts among whom the Antonian ideal had spread assembled in multitudes, and as their numbers increased so grew also their zeal. And from this undisciplined zeal there was to emerge by a natural development that ordered monasticism to which religion and learning in later ages were to be so deeply indebted.

But we must not think that the mass of its votaries adopted this life without tentative steps. Had there been no Antony these would still have been taken, though they might have been barren of result. We must look for its beginning as a prevalent custom to the habit of the most serious among the Christian peasantry of Egypt of retiring to the outskirts of their village and there living a life of quiet manual labour and of meditation. We must think of them as each sheltering from the sun under a little hut of boughs reared by his own hands, cultivating perhaps a plot of garden ground for his own sustenance and for sale, or weaving rush-mats to be taken in due time to market. This latter employment, being sedentary and allowing the mind full play as the fingers plied their

mechanical task, seems to have been regarded as especially suitable for their avocation. The life was not one of isolation from the world, withdrawn though it was from its competition and from the dangers of society. The recluse worked for his living, and sold for his modest sustenance the produce of his toil: in this preliminary phase we do not find him supported by his admirers in the world. Nor was he, in his dwelling close to his old home and friends, isolated from their society. Many of his hours, no doubt, were spent in meditation, or in prayer, or the repetition of Psalms; but he was always accessible, and there was a constant desire on the part of admiring neighbours to benefit by his discourse. And this discourse, as we may judge from the fragments which have survived, was, as a rule, well worthy of attention. In our own recent fiction we have become familiar with the pithy and sententious utterance on moral and religious topics of the graver minds among humble Scottish Presbyterians. Their solitary hours at the loom or the plough, with minds exercised upon the same problems of the relation between doctrine and life, and the same possibilities of devotional attainment, have bred in them the same capacity for concise and impressive speech. In the ancient and in the modern instances there may be in this something angular, some half-unconscious sense of superiority; but as the ancient Spartans and some of the Greek philosophers gained the same power through the discipline of strenuous action and of sustained thought, so in these Christian instances we must recognize the fruit of a true discipline of character. As time went on, no doubt, this mode of speech became the mark of a class, and an imitative devotee could learn the fashion as easily as a modern literary man; but a certain dignity always, and often a power and even a charm, attaches to the brief sayings of the Egyptian monks. Far more than their austerities or eccentricities it is their words that make the interest of their lives.

But this life on the edge of the village which, Athanasius tells us, was usual at the first, soon ceased to satisfy. For a while the hermits hovered around their homes like



Chronius, who ventured fifteen thousand paces into the wilderness and there built his cell, and sometimes they would, after a while, creep nearer, like Nathanael, who found that harder temptations, and therefore worthier to be faced, befell him in his original cell than in that which he had afterwards raised in a remoter spot. So he returned, and it is significant of the rising standard of austerity that when Palladius visited the scene, a little before 400 A.D., no monk would condescend to inhabit a spot so near to the dwellings of men. Nathanael's cell had remained empty for the fifteen years since his death. But others, and without censure, resumed their life among men, as, for instance, that Isidore, who was Palladius' first informant. In later life he held the position of priest and hospitaller in the Church of Alexandria, and used his opportunities of intercourse to tell his stories of the heroes of asceticism, and to counsel his hearers to embrace the monastic life.

The primary aim was perfection, to be attained by escape from the distractions of the world. The soul could then devote itself to its own improvement, conquering its enemy, the body. 'It kills me: I kill it,' said one enthusiast in explanation of his long-continued austerities, which seemed to his admirers to have fulfilled their purpose, though he would not forsake them. The mind, in its retirement from active pursuits, could also surrender itself to contemplation; and we must recognize the success with which the path of mysticism was followed in a climate and with a range of ideas which seem unsuitable for the stimulation of severe or exalted thought. They wished to be perfect; they were threatened with the danger of forfeiting their own perfection while they ministered to the edification, or perhaps merely to the curiosity, of those who resorted to their tabernacles. And so the further steps were taken, and the adventurers plunged deeper and deeper into the wilderness. Yet it was difficult to shake off the serious admirers of the Christian athlete; for many, without the resolution or the originality to take the first step for themselves, were ready to follow a recognized leader even in his further advances. He had no thought

but for himself and for the attainment of an ideal, but he could not shake off disciples whom a contagious enthusiasm gathered round him. So Chronius 'enthroned' himself, to use Palladius' term, in a hermitage by a well which he dug some miles from the river, and there abode for the remainder of a long life. He had vowed never to return to the society of men, but though he kept his vow he could not escape from his fellows. Some intercourse, in any case, he must have had with them, for he maintained himself by his own labour, and so must have employed messengers to convey his handiwork to market and bring him back the price; nor did he shun visitors who came to admire or to learn. He was, in fact, an ascetic of the original type, but so eminent that there gathered around him a company of no less than two hundred hermits desirous of his teaching. Among them were men of mark for spiritual insight, such as Jacob the lame, a 'perfect gnostic,' though perhaps Clement would not have recognized an altogether kindred spirit in him, and Paphnutius, surnamed Cephalas, who, as we have said, could not read, but had a grace of knowledge which enabled him to interpret all passages of either Testament. Here, again, we see that devout concentration upon Scripture which connects these ancient ascetics with Christians very different in their thoughts and environment in later ages. This company surrounding Chronius had no bond save that which connected all with the common teacher. It was only, on a larger and a lasting scale, such resort to a meditative recluse as had been usual since men began to devote their life to thought and prayer. Chronius had no responsibility for the worship or the meditations of his admirers, save in so far as he replied to their inquiries; still less was he responsible for their sustenance or for their discipline. It was a parish, for practical purposes, which arose about him, and as such was recognized by the bishop, who conferred priest's orders upon him that he might minister to the spiritual needs of the society. And, as a normal Christian community, though composed entirely of males and of ascetics, it differed in its regular provision of the Eucharist from the

usual assemblages of monks. In them the sacramental life, which was obviously difficult for the single hermit, and impossible when with heightened austerity he rejected all intercourse with his kind, could not be highly regarded. They inherited the traditions of their solitary precursors, and it was not on Egyptian soil that the usual means of grace were made a normal part of the monastic life. No doubt when the opportunity came, as it often must since priests frequently joined themselves to the societies of monks, it was gladly received; but the great St. Basil of Caesarea was the first to ordain, by an improvement upon the Pachomian rule, that communion should be a regular part of the life of his monks.

Without a formal organization no higher point than this could be reached. The hosts of ascetics who lived without rule in hovels or caves scattered over the Nitrian or Scetic wastes represented a more rudimentary type of the institution. They had the encouragement, it is true, of numbers, though they had severed themselves from the society and the admiration of their homes, but the novelty of the life and its excitement tempted them to rivalry. Even when the competition was for the attainment of the completest solitude, the recluse was always conscious that eyes were upon him, and that another might win to-morrow the prize of reputation which he had just gained by the most difficult feat as yet accomplished of isolation or of abstinence. But the history of the Church furnished another and perhaps a more powerful motive. Sufferers for their Master had always been held in peculiar honour, and from the beginning of the third century, if not earlier, this honour had expressed itself in the form of a definite precedence. Like bishops and presbyters, they sat in the assembly of the faithful, while deacons and laity stood; their 'confession' was regarded as in some sense an ordination, and they claimed the right, within very vague limits, of restoring to the communion of the Church those who had lapsed in the conflict in which they themselves had stood firm. They came to receive, almost in a technical sense, the title 'Friends of God'; and thus Eusebius in

his florid panegyric at the opening of the Church at Tyre addresses them, while Tertullian had exhorted the penitent to grovel before the presbyters and to clasp the knees of the 'cari Dei.' By the time of Eusebius it had come to be an honorary distinction; in the days of Tertullian the prerogative of the 'confessor' was an important reality. And such, no doubt, it would have continued to be, had not the multitude who claimed, with more or less justice, the title and its privileges become unwieldy and dangerous. It is the merit of the Church of Carthage under St. Cyprian and of his Roman contemporaries that they withstood the demand of the 'confessors' to control the discipline of the Church. The clergy were successful, but they had found it necessary to exercise tact as well as determination, and part of the price which they had to pay for the surrender of the confessors' prerogatives was a full recognition of their titular position. The culmination of their glory came with the persecution of Diocletian and his successors. With the proclamation of peace there flocked into every church from prison and mine and wilderness a crowd of sufferers, justly proud of their achievement. And when it became clear that in the new age of favour for Christianity they could have no successors, the survivors, as their ranks were thinned by death, rose steadily higher in the veneration of the faithful. But theirs was not merely a personal distinction; they had come to be a recognized grade in the Church. There must be some method found of perpetuating the succession. If a hostile state would not inflict suffering, the enthusiast would inflict it upon himself, and if the suffering were real and the devotion which prompted it sincere, the result would be equivalent to that of a new pagan persecution. There would be a fresh host of 'confessors' entitled to the honours of their fore-runners. Such reasoning satisfied the Christian mind, and by the middle of the fourth century 'confessor' had come to be the recognized title for the monk or ascetic.

There was, of course, one broad distinction. The new confession was not a sharp, temporary trial, to be rewarded by a lifelong respect from the whole brotherhood. We



hear, it is true, of cases in which the ascetic did return to the world, and was duly respected for the trial to which he had submitted himself; but such cases were exceptional. The normal confession of the new type was lifelong, and its merit increased with its duration. Isolation and austerity practised by one who could at any moment return to the world offered a temptation increasingly severe as each day passed, and therefore a steady increase of honour when that temptation was steadily resisted. And the honour itself had to be manifested and appreciated in a new way. There were none of the familiar tokens of distinction; there was only the silent consciousness of veneration given and received. But this was enough to encourage the enthusiast; at least, when it was joined, as we have no right to doubt that it usually was, with the sincere desire for a growth towards Christian perfection. Persecution had been most severe and the honours of the confessor most conspicuous at Alexandria, and we may assign to the ascetics who withdrew from that city into the neighbouring wastes the desire to perpetuate the class of confessors as their primary motive. The Coptic villagers, a race as alien from the Greeks of Alexandria as the native Irish from the Ulster immigrants, deserve the equal honour of conceiving the thought of a Christian perfection to be approached by an uninterrupted attention to the things of the soul. To neither does it seem that there occurred as the primary motive the employment of the whole life for the direct glory of God, an aim which their successors were in time to propose to themselves.

But the process by which the goal of perfection or the renown of confessorship was to be reached became itself to its whole-hearted pursuers an attraction. Sometimes reasonably, sometimes in defiance of reason, they chose paths which they followed in either case into extravagance. It is true that in the earlier stages of the movement we find no artificial sufferings; there were no chains or spikes to serve as a substitute for the tortures by which the confessors in pagan days had won their renown. But discomfort they must have, and they found it in rejecting the ordinary

amenities and sometimes even the decencies of life. The usual clothing of the Egyptian was a linen tunic, and we find monks who practised and insisted on others practising a scrupulous neatness in the use of this cool and appropriate apparel. But others preferred the Scriptural example of the Baptist in wearing a robe woven of camel's hair, or even the oppressive weight of a leathern tunic. Paul the hermit wove his own of the strips of palm-leaves; it must have resembled in texture the mats which the recluses habitually worked with their hands. But a sack served Hilarion of Palestine as his tunic, and Palladius found a Sarapion—Dom Butler counts eight of the name in the ranks of the ascetics—who wore a linen sheet wrapped round him like a shroud. Whatever the material, the more rigorous ascetics wore it to tatters; Pachomius himself, who introduced order into asceticism, resented the kindly officiousness of disciples who replaced his old tunic by a new one. Others would mend their garment till it became a patchwork, while Pambo pronounced that no true monk should wear a robe save such as might lie for three days in the highway without any traveller deigning to pick it up. Whatever the comfort, or discomfort, of the tunic, and of the long mantle often worn out of doors, the cape of sheepskin or of goatskin borne upon the shoulders must have been a heavy load under the Egyptian sun. Such was the clothing of those who were more or less in contact with their kind. If they were often neglectful, we may imagine how fragmentary was the garb of those who shunned the dwellings of men, nor is it surprising to learn that in the deeper recesses of the deserts the traveller might find anchorites who had abandoned all clothing, and we may believe, if we can, that their unshorn hair had grown till it was a sufficient covering.

There was, however, little discomfort in the wearing of scanty clothes in a climate of continuous warmth; and there may have lurked unperceived in the mind even of the austere monk some of that sense of comfort which prompts the modern to retain an old coat long after its seemliness has departed. In regard to food, even when all allowance is

made for the lightness of diet which is suited to an almost tropical temperature, the case was widely different. The life of the monk was usually sedentary, and must have been painfully monotonous for those whose brains were incapable of strenuous and continuous thought. The irksomeness he would regard as part of the discipline to which he was willingly subjecting himself ; but he could not avoid counting the hours which separated the few fixed points of his day. Among these the meal, or meals, must have been exceedingly prominent. It is a common experience that travellers on a long voyage come to look forward with an eager expectation to the hours of their meals. It is not that they are especially hungry, still less that they are greedy ; it is because a meal is a definite break in a somewhat purposeless expanse of time. It was so with the early monks. They had a liberty uncontrolled by the orderly arrangements of a mail steamer, and often they were tempted to use it to anticipate by an hour their midday meal. This slight and very natural offence is gravely noticed and rebuked. No reproach could be made against the material or the cookery of their simple fare. Simple it had need to be, and even deficient as compared with the sustenance needful for a busy man ; for the special trial of the isolated monk was a temptation for which the very circumstances of his life gave him the leisure, that of brooding over thoughts of sensuality. If he were full-fed, the temptation would be overpowering ; fasting was needed to correct the balance. Thus the pallor of inadequate nutrition came to be accepted as one of the marks of the true monk, while the listlessness and melancholy which it engendered became in their turn enemies to be withstood. Acedia or accidie, or however else the word may be spelled, has a very prominent place in monastic literature, and doubtless, though it was an enemy of their own creation, they deserve due honour for confronting and overcoming it.

But the limitation of food came itself to be regarded as an opportunity for excellence. The Pachomian rule, which allowed two meals a day, may be regarded as representing the average standard of abstinence ; nor was it a low one in

the case of men who made it a principle that they should take no pleasure in their food. Their choice, indeed, was such that ordinary mortals could not easily have found satisfaction in it. Animal food was absent, and in practice, though not in principle, wine also was eschewed. The bread was often kept deliberately till it was dry, and in a parching climate it was regarded as a merit to drink as little water as was possible. The fruits of the country, and especially dates, were commonly used; rustic monks, like the country children of England, knew of a multitude of edible seeds and fruits from which some nutriment could be derived. The plot which was watered by their well would furnish a salad of raw herbs. But some shrank from such luxury. They would eat nothing that had been cultivated, or they would refrain from anything that had undergone the process of cooking. In such a case beans or grain which had been soaked in cold water was the daily food. And often the athlete raised his standard by abstinence from his second meal, and, as that grew easy, by eating only on alternate days. But this was a moderate renunciation in comparison with some of which we read, as when for seventy successive weeks an ascetic partook of only one meal in the week. This may well be an exaggeration, but it is obvious that the ambition to excel in abstinence must often have led to a death in life during which existence could only be maintained at the price of an entire cessation from all activity of body and of mind. In such cases the reward was not the spiritual advancement of the devotee but the knowledge that he was the object of public wonder. When Dorotheus of Thebes was asked by Palladius why in his old age—he had been a hermit for sixty years—he mortified his body by one scanty meal a day, he could answer, no doubt with justification, ‘It kills me: I kill it.’ There was the consciousness of a definite purpose which had been attained. But when an admired faster, to whom his neighbours looked up with awe for his triumphs of abstinence, was invited by the shrewd Zeno to spend a few days in his cell, he was humiliated to find that his powers had failed. Zeno informed him, when he expressed surprise



at the failure, that flattery had been his food, and advised him in future to take a meal every day and be careful that his good deeds were done in secret. But rarely can such good sense have reached the ears of an ascetic ; and perhaps few were aware of the practical advice of St. Jerome, who bids the monk eat as slowly as possible. In this way, he says, the nourishment is greater, just as the earth is more refreshed by a gentle than by a violent rain.

The life, in any case, conduced to longevity. Exaggeration was inevitable, it is true, in an age when length of years was the traditional attribute of the sage, and when the date of a birth which had never been accurately recorded was lost in the mists of time and there were no kinsfolk and no landmarks in an eventless life to call it to mind. But the uniform testimony of the visitors to the wilderness assures us that veterans were numerous who believed that they had passed their hundredth year. It is said that the Coptic monks of the present day, whose habits, physical and mental, have probably varied but little from those of their earliest predecessors, attain to a similar length of days. For we must not think of the normal monk as attempting austerities or attaining heights or depths of feeling, such as have given fame to the more remarkable members of his class. The modern Benedictine from his higher level of civilization and of emotion is apt to look down upon the schismatic peasants who pursue in what he regards as thoughtless indolence their traditional mortifications. We may better regard them as genuine inheritors and maintainers of the pristine average of monastic life, though assuredly it would not have survived had it not been illustrated by more aspiring characters than those of the crowd.

The dwelling of the monks, so long as it furnished shelter from the sun, might in a rainless climate be as small and as simple as they would. We have seen that the earliest recluses raised their huts on the verge of their village, and doubtless of the clay or the wickerwork which was customary in rustic places. No change would take place in their habitation when they made their first modest

step of a mile or two towards the desert : the toil of carrying their pitcher of water through the sand from the river was a sensible hardship, but often some little spring was the attraction which decided their choice, and then a more perfect retirement was purchased at an easy cost. Even the alkaline water of the waste became through use palatable and wholesome, as on many a South African farm where the visitor finds the water playing strange pranks with his digestion, though he does not, like the ancients, attribute his hosts' immunity to miraculous causes. But soon their eye was caught by the rocky ranges which bounded the valley, and a ready home was found in the quarried sepulchres of ancient Egypt or in natural caverns. There the solitary could find a solitude worthy of the name, unless indeed he made a reputation and imitators gathered around him. From the concourse of village admirers he was safe in such a 'monastery,' for so his cell was styled. And when the solitude was attained it was found by the best to be a real aid towards their communion with God. As Moses climbed into the cloud on Sinai, so they went alone into the wilderness for the same sacred converse. Solitude was Paradise ; it was loneliness to be in the crowd. No effort was too great in search of perfect isolation. We hear of a hermitage which lay at the distance of a day's journey and a half into the desert from the nearest abode of men, and the journey had to be made by night, for there was no track and bearings must be taken by the stars. It was St. Antony who first took the plunge, and his followers were no commonplace votaries ; they were either resolute through spiritual desire or through the monomania for solitude which overcame some excited brains. For we find some whom isolation itself, and not its religious use, attracted. We hear of one carving out for himself cell and passage and cell, each further into the mountain side, till his dwelling became as complex and as rude as a badger's earth. We find another equally successful in shunning his kind by fixing his abode amid the slime and fever and stinging flies of the marshes of the Delta. When other, and more rational, monks expostulated with one such ascetic for his choice,

he grimly replied that a life spent in such a residence was preferable to an hour of hell. In such surroundings none of the activities of life were possible. We hear of a hermit who had not spoken for thirty years, and we may reasonably doubt the value of his meditations when the organ of intelligence was paralyzed through disuse. Nor can we doubt that the delusions to which the monks were often subject were mainly due to the want of balance produced by such a life.

These delusions play a large, and to our mind a painful, part in the early days of monasticism. But in the eyes of contemporary admirers its morbid developments were among the best credentials of the new asceticism. It was an age of wonders, and the wonders were by no means confined to the Christians. A religious and cultured pagan lived in a world of marvels at least as astonishing and quite as probable. The atmosphere in which such beliefs were bred was that of the century, not that of a particular creed. And the simple monks of the Nile valley were not far removed in their modes of thought from those Africans of whom Dr. E. B. Tylor tells in his *Primitive Culture* that their sense of reality is so faint and their dreams so vivid that they are never either thoroughly awake or thoroughly asleep. To this we must add the pleasure in gossip, already mentioned as characteristic of religionists of more creeds than one on the banks of the Nile : a pleasure in passing on stories of wonder which grew steadily more wonderful in the process of transmission, and indulgence in which so demoralized the monastic life that one of Pachomius' rules of self-denial, and we may be sure that it was an abstinence keenly felt, was that no tales of things seen or heard outside the monastery should be repeated within its walls. The same necessity compelled St. Benedict in his recension of the Pachomian rule, to repeat the order. He had found that such narratives were, as he calls it in his quaint Latin, 'plurima destructio' to his monks. In the travels of Palladius no less than seventy wonders, as Dom Butler counts, were reported to that conscientious inquirer ; for only ten does he vouch from personal knowledge, but his

confidence in his informants is not less strong than his trust to his own eyes and ears. Indeed, we have the evidence of Palladius' eyes for a marvel at least as great as any performed at the Egyptian Hall. A boy possessed by an evil spirit was brought to Macarius of Alexandria while Palladius was visiting that eminent ascetic. Macarius laid his hands upon him and prayed with such effect that the boy was lifted into the air, swelled like a wineskin to a monstrous size, burst and discharged a torrent of water, and then subsided to his natural dimensions and was a reasonable and healthy being. Macarius anointed him with holy oil, poured water upon him and delivered him to his father with the injunction to abstain for forty days from flesh and from wine. The same Macarius was the hero according to Palladius—who reports the story, however, only as a current tale—of an adventure in the vein of Apuleius. The evil lover of a virtuous woman bribed a magician to transform her into a mare. Her distressful husband—for she was not so lonely as the Apuleian ass—led her to the saint, who did not need to be told of the trouble, for he had received a revelation. He blessed water and sprinkled it over her. She recovered her form and was dismissed with her husband, after a warning to be careful in the discharge of her religious duties, since it was her absence for five weeks from the Eucharist that had rendered her subject to the power of magic. In our estimate of the credibility of these records, of which that of Palladius is one of the most sober, we must bear in mind that these strange incidents which he had seen or heard of were no less credible to him than the conventional visions and miracles of ordinary hagiography in which his story, it is needless to say, abounds.

But we must in justice take into our account the powers which certainly accrue to mind and will when they are purified and strengthened. Insight into character, that strange yet real power called 'second sight,' healthful influence upon the mental and physical state of others, the gift of attracting and controlling the wildest creatures of the desert, are endowments which we should expect and which we find among the best of the solitaries. We find also that they



were not over-valued. The utterances of St. Antony in this respect, as reported by St. Athanasius, are the same in tone as those of Gregory the Great in his famous warning to St. Augustine not to think too highly of the miracles which had, as they both believed, accompanied the conversion of Kent. And the wiser among the Egyptians were careful to impress the lesson that a fall from grace was possible for those who had attained to the power of miracle or vision; nay, more, they could allege striking instances in which the exercise of such power was itself the occasion of falling.

There remains one more aspect of this supernatural side of monasticism to be mentioned. The cases are numerous and clear in which a mental temptation personified itself as a bodily assailant. Like Henry Morton in *Old Mortality*, Palladius was the unseen hearer of defiance against the spiritual enemy; but it must be confessed that the Egyptian Mark had a more prosaic opponent and used a less dignified vocabulary than Balfour of Burleigh. His language, in fact, has a strong resemblance to that of Falstaff. But demons were sometimes visible. Macarius of Alexandria saw countless tiny Ethiopians overrunning the persons of an assembly of monks. If they touched his eyes, the victim slept; if they pushed a finger into his mouth, he yawned; they conjured up before his imagination any image that might distract him from his prayers. And one solitary, harassed as he sat in his cell by an invisible crowd of demons who demanded entrance, had the satisfaction of beholding their final disappearance in the guise of a troop of wild asses. But the monks had the consolation that angels were as real to them as demons. Stories to this effect are numerous. To one of them the Eucharist was habitually ministered by an angel; while another had an angel as his domestic attendant. And this vivid and concrete presentation of powers elsewhere invisible was probably the cause of that error which brought a later generation of monks into sharp conflict with the Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria. They gave a literal meaning to the figurative language of Scripture, and inferred from the

mention of His eyes and ears that the Deity is corporeal. Hence arose what Socrates calls a relentless war—Theophilus, with a minority of the monks on his side, branding his adversaries as Anthropomorphians, while they retorted that he and his followers were impious Origenists. But force was on the side of Theophilus and his opponents were silenced. From such an aberration no profit could come; but the developed doctrine of guardian angels was the direct result of the vivid imagination of Egyptian ascetics. And the same imagination has the honour of introducing into Christian literature the notion of journeys into the realms of the dead. Their rudimentary visions are the germ of the whole splendid range of Keltic imaginings, from the Purgatory of St. Patrick and the Penitence of Tundal down to the Sleeping Bard, as well as of the supreme example in the *Divina Commedia*.

Hitherto we have been considering the separate life of individuals. But, lonely as they might be, they had always the consciousness of neighbourhood. Even the most distant from mankind cherished the thought that others were less remote than they. Comparison and even rivalry was constantly in their mind. It had its good side in keeping many up to the mark; it had its bad side in such extravagances as we have noticed, and sometimes in strange outbursts of spiritual pride and affectation, as when Dorotheus would habitually weep at his meals over the painful necessity under which he, a spiritual being and entitled to feast upon the delights of Paradise, lay of eating earthly food. But even competition was a bond of union, for monks were not striving to excel the world. Over it the victory was already won; the objects of their rivalry were their brother monks. Hence it was natural that they should cluster together, sometimes in their thousands, in what for them was neighbourhood. They would welcome a new recruit, assembling to build his hut as Connaught peasants to-day will raise in a few hours the cabin of a newly-wedded pair. He might be his own master or he might put himself, voluntarily and for such a space as he chose, under the orders of an experienced ascetic: he might live

alone or in company with some few of his brethren. In no case could he isolate himself from his monastic world. He must meet others in common worship, at least occasionally, unless he forsook mankind altogether; even then some religious tourist would sooner or later discover him. In ordinary cases he would be well informed of the feats and the sayings of his brethren, and if he were spurred to say or do something still more striking there was nothing to restrain and much to tempt him to extravagance. Such a monasticism as St. Antony had encouraged was fertile in men of varied excellence, and it set the example, which was to have evil as well as good effects, of regarding monasticism as Christianity in the full sense. But it could neither ensure discipline among its adherents nor develop a consistent type of character. This was to be the work of Pachomius the Great, as his followers called him, who completed the work which Antony had begun.

The two men were almost exact contemporaries. Both began to gather disciples about the year 305, though in this respect Pachomius had the less success. His rule, the first of its kind, was written before 328, and he died in 346. He was personally an ascetic of a strict type: the 'Stone Couch of St. Pachomius' in the *Monastery* is one of Scott's many pieces of recondite knowledge of antiquity. But his genius appeared in his recognition of the truth that uniformity of life and a level standard of excellence could not be attained without a check upon the ambitions of the more eager ascetics. The rule was to govern the life of all; even the abbot was to govern in accordance with its precepts. There were to be no eccentricities of life; food and clothing were to be simple and seemly. There was to be order and silence in the performance of duties; monks were to work for their living, at some trade in the monastery or as hired labourers in the harvest field. Soon lands of their own were obtained, and the monastery grew into an industrial organization, with some of the dangers to which such a society is liable. But from the first charity was rejected: monasticism was to be self-supporting. For the spiritual life there were the reading and exposition of

Scripture and regular hours of prayer. The Eucharist, as we have seen, had not a prominent place; its reception and attendance at its celebration were not more frequent than in the case of devout laymen. Monks were not to be ordained to the priesthood, though priests might become monks. An ordered life was secured by the residence of the whole body within a ring-wall, such as may still be seen in the ruins of the early Irish monasteries. The monks were grouped in houses, either by trade or by race; there was not only the supervision of monastic superiors but also the mutual control of the brethren, though as yet without that minute and often humiliating surveillance which grew up in the Benedictine system. This disciplined life, moderated by the fixing of a standard at which all might aim, was as possible for women as for men, and thus for the first time the monastic career was thrown open to them. The spirit of the whole life was that of discipline, though as yet without that insistence upon military analogies which afterwards prevailed. It is true that the suggestion has been made that Pachomius learnt directly from his military experience, and modelled his communities upon it. But he had no more than one brief term of service, while yet a pagan, as a pressed militiaman. He saw no fighting and withdrew to civil life as quickly as he could. He must have acquired elsewhere the gift of organization which enabled him to control several thousands of monks dwelling in numerous monasteries and in no case bound by vows.

The pattern set by this great man, one of the epoch-makers of Christendom though so little regarded in our day, was instantly followed. For a while the Antonian method was more popular, and the fungus-growth of eccentrics with strange titles and stranger habits of whom we read in Jerome and Epiphanius was more conspicuous. But St. Basil and St. Benedict, loyal disciples of Pachomius, have stamped his mark upon all the later developments of monasticism; and even its intellectual life had its starting-point at the Tabennisi which Pachomius founded. The practical psychology which was studied there with its classification



of mental states and especially of vices was to be the germ of all casuistry and of much scholastic philosophy. It was a great work, and one begun in transparent and disinterested simplicity of heart; and amid all the vicissitudes and irregularities of its history we recognize with gratitude and reverence the value of its ideal, that of a common life persistently and unselfishly striving towards the highest end.

E. W. WATSON.

#### ART. VI.—LONDON HOME INDUSTRIES AND THE SWEATING OF WOMEN'S LABOUR.

1. *Problems of Modern Industry* (1898). *Women's Industrial Council. Home Industries of Women in London.* By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. (London: Longmans).
2. *Women's Work and Wages.* By E. CADBURY and G. SHANN. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)
3. *Pictures and Problems* and *The Problem of the Home Workers.* By T. HOLMES. (London: E. Arnold, 1900.)
4. *Sweated Industries.* By R. MUDIE SMITH. (London: Daily News Office, 1906.)
5. *Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Sweating.* First Report, 1888; Second Report, 1888; Third Report, 1889; Fourth and Fifth Reports, 1890. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.)

#### I.

JUST two years ago, by the kind permission of the Duke and Duchess of Sutherland, a number of women were taken by the writer to Stafford House that they might give a public exposition of the lives, the work, and the earnings of London Home Workers. Each woman and the life which she led were well known to him, and each was a *bona fide* representative of some sweated trade. A few words will make clear both the method of the selection and the reasons for it. In the first place, each woman

chosen maintained herself by her own exertions, and worked at some particular trade in her own home, fetching from the factory the materials, and returning to the factory the finished articles. Secondly, care was taken that they should include only those who were extremely skilful, and who had been engaged in their special work for many years, this selection being necessary if a correct estimate were to be obtained of the earnings of such women and the hours which they worked. Thirdly, in selecting the trades to be represented, only those trades were included which exist on a large scale. Briefly, these are the making of ladies' costumes, children's coats, cloaks, &c., babies' bonnets, fur-sewing, artificial flowers, match-boxes, fountain-pen boxes, sweet and chocolate boxes, toothbrushes, and ladies' skirts.

These trades, then, it may fairly be said, were represented by experts. It was impossible not to admire their skill, and at the same time scarcely possible, as one looked at them, to refrain from shuddering, for their dreadfully automatic movements were the outcome of endless repetition. But, such as they were, the workers selected represented not only the industries in which thousands of women in London are engaged, but they represented also the lives which thousands of women have to lead and the suffering they endure.

We propose to take eleven typical cases, and without exaggeration, or laying on of 'colour,' to endeavour to set before our readers a fair picture of these women, of their different homes, and of the conditions under which they live, and work, and die.

They looked very tidy and respectable as they sat at their work in Stafford House; for self-respect was not yet dead within them, and they had made the best of themselves. But no one who watched them could fail to notice how quiet and how passive they were. There was no animation in their features, no gleam of interest, but just a touch of pathetic wonder, as if they would ask what it was all about. Their presence and their appearance were an object-lesson, but they had not come to give utterance to

their wrongs ; for to them wrongs are non-existent—they have become human machines.

One by one they were called to the platform to answer questions, holding their work in their hands. No. 1 was an artificial flower maker, and held a great basket of well-arranged flowers, which excited considerable admiration.

‘Are these all of your own making?’ the writer asked.

‘Yes, sir.’

‘Did you draw and cut all the wire for these flowers?’

‘Yes, sir.’

‘Did you fix and shape all those petals on the wire stems?’

‘Yes, sir.’

‘Now tell me, please, how much do you get for making these lovely roses?’

‘Two shillings per gross.’

‘The violets?’

‘Sixpence per gross.’

‘These clusters of apple-blossom, how much?’

‘One shilling and sixpence a gross.’

And so on with regard to all the contents of the basket.

‘How long have you been a flower-maker?’

‘Ever since I was seven years old—I am now sixty.’

‘How much money can you earn in one hour?’

‘One penny farthing, sir.’

‘How many hours do you work daily?’

‘Sixteen, when I have the work to do.’

‘How much rent do you pay for your room?’

‘Four-and-sixpence a week, sir.’

A half-blind man about her own age was listening to her, and as she stepped down from the platform he gave her his hand, and she sat down beside him. Husband and wife, for many years and interminable hours they had sat at flower-making together, he stamping out the petals and colouring them, and she moulding and mounting them. Now he is half-blind, and dropsy and heart-disease have laid hold on him ; so she must work for both, and bravely she does it.

No. 2 was a costume machinist, and shewed two costumes for ladies such as she was accustomed to make. For these she gets tenpence each, and finds her own machine and thread. For eighteen years her daughter and herself have sat at their machines making costumes. They work fourteen hours daily, and the two, combining their efforts, can earn seven shillings and sixpence in two days—that is, with the aid of *her own* machine, each woman can earn one shilling and tenpence in fourteen hours. But they must buy their own thread, and this costs them one shilling and fourpence weekly. Seldom do their combined earnings for the week amount to one guinea.

No. 2 is forty-five years of age ; her hair is white, her face is wrinkled and furrowed, her hands are tremulous, and her nerves are broken. Mother and daughter live in a poor street. Next door to them is a small public-house, and at half-past twelve its doors are closed. ‘Mother, the men have just gone by ; the public-house is closed. Let us go to bed.’ So the machines rest, and a few hours’ silence follow, before the daily round begins again.

No. 3 was a maker of boxes to hold fountain-pens, for which she gets one shilling per gross. She is but a poor specimen of humanity. She is small in stature, sharp in features, and bent in body ; she is hunch-backed, her arms are long and skinny, her fingers long and bony. But those skinny arms and bony fingers can work with the speed of a shuttle and the dead certainty of an automatic machine. Better still, that broken body holds a very brave heart. She works for herself and her old mother ; she can earn about one penny per hour. Her mother is partly paralyzed, and lies in bed most of her time. Sometimes, however, she is propped up in her bed, and her old fingers ply the scissors as she does her best to help the hunchback daughter.

No. 4 was a young widow with three children, and she produced toothbrushes, which were passed round for inspection. There are sixty-two little holes in the body of each brush, and sixty-two little bunches of bristles have



to be picked up in exact quantities, given a correct bend, passed through the little holes, and left tight and firm, of proper length, and fastened at the back with copper wire.

‘What do you get for these?’

‘Fourpence a dozen brushes, sir.’

‘You are a quick and clever brush-maker?’

‘I’m as good as most, sir!’

‘How long does it take you to do a dozen brushes?’

‘I can make one dozen in two hours, but I can’t keep on at that rate.’

‘What rent do you pay?’

‘Five-and-sixpence for two rooms, sir.’

No. 5 was another widow. She and her daughter, who stood with her on the platform, were a refined and fairly educated pair—a moving picture of struggling respectability. The work which they exhibited was very dainty. The first costume was a child’s pelisse made of cream merino, trimmed and flounced all over and decorated with lace, &c.

‘We get sevenpence for that, sir, and we find our own silk and thread.’

‘What do you get for the sky-blue pelisse?’

‘The same price, sir; but it takes us longer than the other.’

‘What time do you begin to work?’

‘That depends on the light, sir; but we always work fifteen hours a day when we can get sufficient work.’

‘You are a widow?’

‘Yes, sir.’

‘What was your husband?’

‘An accountant. We lost our money in the *Liberator*.’

‘What rent do you pay?’

‘Six shillings for two rooms.’

‘What does your sewing-silk and cotton cost you weekly?’

‘One shilling?’

‘How many journeys do you make to the City?’

‘ Three every week by tram. That costs us ninepence.’  
And the daughter helped her mother down.

No. 6 had a blind husband and many children. Her husband lost his sight at his employment, so that she became the bread-winner. Fortunately, she says, she had learned a trade when she was young. She could make match-boxes when she was a child, so she makes them now that she is a mother. The clothing which she was wearing had been sent to her the previous day that she might appear decent. The contrast between her own dirty, evil-smelling home, with all its pestiferous environment, and that in which she found herself must have been great, but she did not seem to notice it.

The boxes which she makes were produced. She receives twopence farthing per gross for the ordinary match-boxes ; and, if she works without stopping, she can make one gross in two hours. But she could not work without interruption, for the children took up some of her time. These children also helped to make match-boxes, and the day before she had kept her little boy at home to help her to finish her boxes that she might come to Stafford House. She had three very small rooms, and paid six shillings rent.

No. 7, another widow, was left with seven children, two of whom are at work but have left home. Her daughter, aged seventeen, is at home ill, and her youngest child, aged four, lies in bed, for he is unable to stand.

By trade she was a fancy-box maker, and shewed some beautiful boxes, covered with silver paper outside, and lined with enamelled paper within, to hold sweets and chocolates &c. She gets one shilling and threepence per gross for them ; but for this sum she has also to make and include six strong cardboard boxes to hold each two dozen of the fancy boxes. These boxes were spotless ; the keenest eye could detect no evidence of dirt. But they had been made under the most sickening conditions, and they had lain upon the miserable bed whereon lay the sick child. The

room in which she works is redolent of melted fish-glue, mingled with other and less innocent odours. In the evening all the children crowd in, and an evil-smelling paraffin lamp adds to the gloom and horror. After a time the children 'go to bed'—in the same room; but the widow goes on working until late into the night.

No. 8 is a group of three women—a mother and two daughters, in poor, black clothing, which tells of the widowhood of each. The old woman is seventy, the daughters about forty years of age. They live in Hoxton, and make 'mourning' flowers, some black, some white. 'Black Tulips' and 'Ragged Robins' are among their specialities in the black department, and thousands of widows the country over have worn flowers made by the widows of Hoxton. But the old lady devotes herself entirely to white flowers, for black tires her poor old eyes. She has her speciality too, and in her way she is an artist. With trembling hands she produced two pretty chaplets or wreaths, each composed of nearly one hundred little white flowers. Every flower has to be made separately. She has drawn the wire and twisted it to make the foundations, she has covered it neatly with white linen, she has fixed every flower in its order, and has inserted the silver leaves which have been supplied from the factory; and when she returns one dozen wreaths, made completely and throughout, she will receive one shilling and ninepence for the dozen—one penny three farthings each.

She held up another wreath; there are twenty-four pure white flowers upon it resembling camelias and beautifully made. For this she will receive twopence halfpenny, or half-a-crown for a dozen completed wreaths. They are 'confirmation wreaths,' and will be exported to Continental countries. Happy-hearted girls will wear them, the hand of the bishop will rest upon them, and God's blessing will be invoked upon the wearers; and the wreaths will be treasured as mementos of a sweetly solemn time.

But what of those who make them? Listen!

'How old are you?'

‘ Seventy-two.’

‘ Have you ever been to school ? ’

‘ No, sir.’

‘ How much can you earn at your work ? ’

‘ About one penny per hour.’

‘ You have no pay from the parish ? ’

‘ No ! ’

The question need not have been asked !

One of her widowed daughters out of her meagre earnings pays five shillings weekly for a single room in which she lives with her boy. Forty hours’ work have to be done every week to pay for that room ; food, firing, and clothing have to be worked for also, but rent comes first.

No. 9 is another widow. She is young, and her ‘ weeds ’ are fresh and new. She is a fur-sewer, making ‘ stoles,’ sealskin and other fur jackets, &c. She has three young children, and her husband, a journeyman baker, died suddenly on Good Friday 1904. A decent, clean, and brave woman she has shewn herself ; and, though her home is in Hoxton, one may safely sit and watch her ‘ stitch, stitch, stitch ’ at her stoles, jackets, or odd pieces of fur. It is hard work ; every stitch must be tightly pulled through, the odd pieces must be made a complete whole, and the fur must run the right way. It is skilled work, too. She worked at fur-sewing when a girl, and continued to do so after marriage in order to supplement her husband’s wages ; and now that she is a widow she considers herself fortunate to have plenty of work to do, and to earn twopence per hour. She has two rooms, and pays six shillings rent. Slowly but surely the residue of the club and insurance money, left after paying for her husband’s funeral, has gone, and now she finds it a difficult matter to pay her rent and feed her children—a task which will become increasingly difficult as her children grow older.

No. 10 is married to a casual labourer, who is often out of work and has proved an indifferent husband. So, with four children, the double burden has fallen upon her



shoulders. She is a machinist, and makes women's skirts, for which she gets tenpence per dozen, finding her own machine and thread. She cannot leave her young children to go to the factory, so she has an arrangement by which the unmade skirts are sent to her by carrier, and returned by her when finished by the same means. She has to pay the carriage both ways—a loss of eightpence on each transaction.

As she told the story of her hard life, she said that she often works on Sunday of necessity, and that her last holiday was fourteen years ago, when she had a day's outing with a Sunday school treat. If she could sit close at work, she might earn twopence in one hour, but not if she were interrupted, and she could not keep it up. Three-halfpence per hour would be a good average.

No. 11 is another widow. She has two children, a boy and a girl, aged ten and twelve. Her fingers had been deftly working unceasingly on materials supplied her by the manufacturer, and while the other poor women were answering questions she had earned twopence. She held up a pretty baby's bonnet, which was passed round from hand to hand and greatly admired. It was a work of art—one of her own creation. Only plain, ordinary material had been supplied to her—lace, merino, silk, and ribbon in the gross; and now the bonnet was finished, and she had earned—twopence. The dark rings round her eyes, and the redness of those eyes, told their own story of close work and long hours; but she makes no complaint. She will tell you that she is better paid than most home workers, and that her great anxiety is insufficiency of work, for she has 'slack times,' and then life is hard. Nevertheless, she admits that she often works long past midnight.

We should like before proceeding further to emphasize several points which the lives of these women seem to illustrate:

First, the women engaged in London home industries

are neither idle, drunken, nor dissolute, but, on the contrary, are respectable, industrious, and honest.

Secondly, sorrow and misfortune are frequently the causes which compel women, who have hitherto been in comfortable circumstances, to seek a livelihood by some kind of home work.

Thirdly, many women after marriage continue to follow these trades that they may supplement the irregular and insufficient earnings of their husbands.

Fourthly, the learning of one of these trades by girls is approved by mothers, who prefer their daughters to 'have a trade in their hands' in case anything should happen to their husbands. In fact, some branch of home work is considered a provision for the future—a kind of insurance against parish relief.

In short, the causes which lead so many women into home industries are: Early training and environment, causing even young children to become experts; early widowhood, which compels the mother to seek some work which can be done at home; insufficient earnings, or illness, of husbands; loss of money or friends by women of middle age.

There remains, however, still another class, and one which adds largely to the difficulties of the matter. The writer is acquainted with several artisans in regular work and in receipt of good wages, who are married and childless. They live in decent houses; and their wives are engaged in some kind of home industry, mantle-making, skirt-making, blouse-making, and the like. Starting with one machine on the hire-system, the business of these women extends rapidly, and other machines follow. 'Apprentices are wanted to learn the trade,' and a number of slatternly girls are soon seated at the machines. The trade is comparatively quickly learned, for it is quite automatic; these girls have then to give way to other 'apprentices,' for it would by no means pay to keep them on as 'journey-women.' They have worked two years for practically nothing, and now, at seventeen years of age, they are at liberty to set up machines on their own account in their

own homes. The woman who has taught them their trade will again provide them with work by handing over to them a portion of the work she herself can get from the factory, but which they cannot get. They are then in the hands of the sub-sweater, who, making a profit on all the work done, is not anxious that her 'outworkers' should be idle. Poor widows resort to such women; and elderly spinsters, who cannot go to the warehouse, resort to them also. Thus it comes to pass that the poor and the helpless, the aged and the infirm, are sweated by one of their more fortunate sisters. Again and again the writer has seen poor women, with sick husbands dependent upon them, engaged on blouses, at tenpence per dozen, received from the sub-sweater. One shilling per dozen was the factory price, and the twopence represented the middlewoman's profit. These blouses are, of course, cheap cotton articles, but they are made by the thousand; and we have known one hundred and eight hours worked in one week by one particular woman at this branch of work.

It may perhaps be suggested that the industries of which concrete examples have been given are not fairly representative of the home industries in London, and that some branches of work are much better paid. We would venture emphatically to maintain that the cases chosen *are* fairly representative. It is true that there are branches of work for which much better prices are paid, but these are few in number. There are also, on the other hand, numerous industries which are much worse paid than those which we have taken; and terrible indeed are the conditions of those which represent the lowest scale in connexion with the manufacture of men's and women's clothing and infants' boots and shoes.

Before dealing with the causes of sweating and the remedies proposed for its prevention, something may be said with regard to its results as reflected in the mental and physical characteristics of the sweated. Eight years ago, when the writer began his special work among these women,

he thought it would be an easy thing to stir them up to resentment and to mutiny against the conditions in which they were forced to live and to work. It is right to say that that idea has long since been abandoned. These women have no sense of injustice: their passivity is appalling and heart-rending: their wish to be let alone is unmistakable. The one thing which frightens them is the prospect of the workhouse or of a parish funeral. Their poor little homes, sometimes dirty and wretched, but always frightfully dear, are the worlds in which they live. Their only recreation is a tramcar ride to or from the factory from which they obtain their work. It is difficult for those who have not known it to realize the conditions of a life in which farthings are of importance. Their small earnings are spent in miserable detail, excepting rent which forms a by no means miserable item in their expenditure. Their clothing is meagre and poor, their food insufficient, expensive and wasteful; for they must perforce buy in the minutest quantities. Their rooms are seldom visited by the painter or decorator; grime becomes habitual, gloom is a normal condition, dirt becomes unnoticeable, thick humid air becomes natural—and aspiration dies. A mechanical perseverance is engendered by interminable hours; and ultimately the finished product, a London home worker, is evolved, who is too often without God and without hope in the world.

A personal illustration may perhaps be permitted of the difficulties of dealing with such cases or of the endeavour to introduce a little change into the weary monotony of their lives by the provision of some place by the sea, to which such women could go for a rest, refreshment, and fresh air. By the kindness of many friends the writer was enabled to found a Home of Rest for them at Walton-on-the-Naze, and a delightful place, almost hidden by roses and other flowers, was provided. But then the difficulties began. It was astonishing to find that the sweated women made all sorts of excuses, although free railway tickets and free entertainment were provided. Here and there one or two, who were broken in health, meekly consented to go; many



firmly refused ; and one, but only one, scorned the offer, not only refusing to take a holiday but bluntly declining to accept any material help. This woman was in fact the only one that the writer has met who resented the conditions under which she lived and the pay she received. She was a mantle-maker, a spinster of considerable age. A friend had authorized him to seek out a number of decent struggling elderly women, who supported themselves by some sweated trade, and to convey to them a monthly pension of ten shillings. A clergyman, who had known the woman for years, gave her name and address, in response to an inquiry for a suitable case, and she was called upon. My heart went out to her as I saw the evidences of a long-continued struggle for existence. I was so glad that it was in my power to help her. So I offered her a fortnight's holiday by the sea and a pension of ten shillings monthly afterwards. In her gloomy room I saw that she turned pale ; but presently her eyes flashed, and she got up from her machine and said, ' Who gave you my name and address ? ' I told her. ' Have I ever asked him for anything ? ' ' Never,' I said. ' Neither do I ask you for anything. Please to leave my room ! ' I could not argue with her, so I sorrowfully went away. As she opened the street door for me, she said, ' I suppose it never occurred to the Vicar and yourself that I might be better paid for my work and charged less for my rent ? ' The iron had entered her soul, and her long-drawn-out grievances had made her bitter. This feeling is rare indeed, but surely it is preferable to the apathetic indifference which becomes the most noticeable feature in most of the sweated women.

A characteristic example of the latter may be given. It is that of a widowed match-box maker, presumably between fifty and sixty years of age, who lived in a poor room in a wretched street of Haggerston. In this room she had lived for fourteen years, ever since her husband's death. Two little beds, dingy and dirty, were in the room, and these were covered with match-boxes. Grime and dirt were everywhere, and the atmosphere was close and unhealthy. Her skin was like wrinkled parchment and of a

smoke-coloured hue. She continued her mechanical work while I sat and talked to her, and she proved communicative enough. Her youngest boy, she told me, now over thirteen, was born in that room; that was his bed in the corner. She did not receive parish relief and had not asked for any, for she could manage without, and was not going into the 'House.' She did not go to church or chapel—she had no time. Neither did any 'Visitors' come to see her—she did not want them. She got twopence farthing a gross for the boxes she was making—she always made the same sort. She often worked fourteen to fifteen hours a day. She had earned as much as ten shillings in a week when she worked on Sundays. She never went out, except to and from the factory—she preferred her own home. She did not know how long it was since her room had been painted and whitewashed; if she asked the landlord to do it he would put sixpence weekly on her rent, which she could hardly pay as it was.

Such was the poor thing's story with her comments. I told her of the Home Workers' Rest House by the sea, and offered to send her for a fortnight. She had no clothes! I offered to send her some clothing. There was the rent! The rent would be paid while she was away. There was the boy! He would go with her. Finally she said that she did not want to go—it was too much trouble!

This woman's state of mind is typical of the vast army of sweated women. For the mechanical perseverance which ensues from endless automatic work leaves neither energy nor thought for anything else: the power to rise above their environment is given only to the very few.

This is the worst that can be said of London's sweated women, since to their everlasting credit it must be added that, their passivity excepted, they are good women, moral, honest, and sober beyond the general standard of the community. Twenty-one years' acquaintance with the police courts and the streets of London enables the writer to affirm that few of these home-working women join the ranks of those 'whose steps lead down to hell.' In this one respect perchance endless work has been the salvation

of some. But, given thousands of women living the lives which have been described, disaster must result and two classes of people must be evolved—the joyless, apathetic automata, with hope and aspiration atrophied; and the superior class, which views without concern, nay looks upon as natural, the existence of the atrophied class living in the nether gloom. This is no imaginary danger: it is real—it is inevitable if the present conditions continue.

## II.

We have given an outline of the conditions under which these sweated women live and work, and also of the reasons why women engage in such work, together with the psychological results so far as the workers themselves are concerned. We propose now to try to ascertain, if possible, the causes which lead to the sweating of women and the best methods of dealing with them.

The one great fundamental cause is the long-held belief that the labour of women is worthy of less remuneration than that of men. This holds true of many other kinds of work besides home industries; and serious results will inevitably follow in the train of our present-day movements and tendencies if women, while asserting their freedom and their equality with men, do not insist on equality of payment when the quantity and quality of their work is equal to the quantity and quality of the work done by men. Hitherto they have not insisted on this principle, and a lower rate of pay ensues. In some respects it speaks badly for women that the rate of pay in those industries which have been considered pre-eminently their own should be so abominably low. For the responsibility for this low pay is not to be laid altogether on the shoulders of the manufacturers; they have accepted a principle hitherto tacitly admitted by women themselves and utilized very largely by women in their dealings with each other. The calculations of the manufacturers have been built upon this fact, and it has been taken into account when estimating their working expenses. It is true that the manufacturers cannot be

wholly absolved, for it is only too well known how ready many of them have been to reduce without notice the insufficient payment of their outworkers; but it is of the utmost importance that women should realize that they have some responsibility in the matter, and that they must take their part in the coming struggle which is, one may hope, destined to bring about a better state of things. Since Thomas Hood wrote the *Song of the Shirt*, hundreds of other industries have developed the same conditions as those which obtained among the sempstresses; and the trades and occupations to which women are now betaking themselves will inevitably descend to a lower plane unless women themselves recognize their duty to each other and to the community generally.

But in many ways women have been helpless; and in apportioning blame it must be remembered that the sorrows of many women, and their commendable desire to maintain themselves and their fatherless children, have added to the difficulties of the case. For such one is bound to feel the greatest pity and admiration; their devotion is unquestionable, their patient perseverance unequalled, and their passive heroism almost unique. But such women are helpless, they cannot protect themselves: work they must have or perish; so they take it at any price that is offered. It seems a horrible satire to say that in a Christian country the hand of the oppressor is heaviest upon those who have the greatest claim to its pity and love—nevertheless it is true. Whatever else may be done in mitigating the evil it is profoundly to be hoped that the time may soon arrive when the widow and the fatherless shall no longer be exploited.

There comes the difficulty—to whom shall we charge the blame? Inquiry is frequently made for a 'White List' of firms, with whom purchasers may safely deal with the knowledge that their goods have been made under decent conditions and at fair prices. Other ladies have wanted a 'Black List' of firms which should be avoided. The latter alternative presents obvious difficulties, and the former is not easy to carry out on a large scale, though



the Christian Social Union has done something in this direction within a limited area. The writer has always personally refrained from complying with either request. It would be easy by a false step to make matters worse than they are at present, nor does it follow that, because articles are cheap, the producer has been insufficiently paid ; for workers are frequently found earning more money upon cheap, and even shoddy, goods than they could upon superior articles. Commercial life is so mixed—so mad, one may almost say—that some of its usages and methods are bound to have serious consequences.

The 'Season' trades in particular are fraught with danger to the manufacturers and to the workers. Some details have already been given with regard to women's clothing made at tenpence per completed costume. These are made in great quantities in anticipation of a good season—Winter, Spring, or Summer. Manufacturers supply retail traders with these goods 'on sale or return.' Should the weather prove suitable for the material of which they are made, all goes well. But should it prove unsuitable, the manufacturer finds himself burdened with a large number of 'returns' and a corresponding loss, since these have to be sold off in 'job lots.' All these risks have to be taken into account by the manufacturer, and a bad season consequently means not only less work for the home-worker but also—a more serious matter—the reduction in the price paid for making the costume. It seems an extraordinary thing that one penny, in the price of a thirty-five-shilling costume, should be a matter of moment to the manufacturer ; but so it is, and after a bad season it is no uncommon thing for 'shilling' costumes (*i.e.* those for the making of which a shilling is paid) to be made for elevenpence, and the elevenpenny ones to be made for tenpence. Once reduced they seldom, if ever, recover. It is much the same in other industries. It is strange that another penny paid on a gross of fountain-pen boxes would make a world of difference to the women who make them, and that we cannot get that penny to the poor workers ; and strange to think that another halfpenny upon a gross

of match-boxes would make the difference between life and death to hundreds of poor families—and yet such is the case. Are prices cut so low in these two trades that this is necessary? We think not; for match firms pay good dividends, and fountain-pens are remunerative.

Under the pressure of competition, manufacturers vie with each other in granting favourable terms to retailers, and as their rents and local rates increase, the manufacturers cut down expenses to the lowest possible limit. One may suppose that there is a limit below which even a woman's costume cannot be made, but we do not appear to have found it. Neither do we appear to have found the limit to which city rents and local rates can rise. So far as the writer's own experience allows him to judge, he would say that the business of retailer is more profitable than that of manufacturer; this opinion is based upon the fact that he has known a number of manufacturers who have paid very low wages, who have lived in modest style and been incessant in their attention to business, and yet have failed to make their businesses pay, and have in old age come down to absolute poverty.

A great deal has been said and written about the evil done by woman's love of 'a bargain'; personally we do not think this has much to do with the sweating system. On the contrary, we firmly believe that the women of England will only be too glad to pay a good price for the things which they buy when they can have the assurance that the goods have been produced under good conditions and the makers fairly remunerated. The heart of humanity is sound, but the brains of the community are terribly wrong.

### III.

It is comforting to find that many people have been seeking remedies for the evil. Certain definite proposals are now before the public—proposals with influential backing—which will, it is contended, eradicate, or at any rate, considerably lessen the evil. These proposals, three in number, may be described as good, bad, and indifferent.

First, there is a demand for the total abolition of all home industries by legal enactment. Employers are to be compelled to provide factory room for all their hands, and 'outwork' is to be abolished. This demand arises from Trade Unions and has the support of various organizations connected with the labour movement generally. In October last a three days' conference was held in the Guildhall and opened by the Lord Mayor of London. A number of able and influential men and women contributed papers for discussion and over three hundred duly appointed delegates were present, representing Trade Unions and the different branches of the Socialist movement. Although this conference was convened by the Anti-Sweating League, which arose out of the *Daily News* Exhibition of Sweated Industries held in May last, and the expenses were borne by the Anti-Sweating League, no delegates were allowed at the Conference except those selected by the organizations named. At the close of the third day's proceedings, a resolution was passed, without a dissentient voice being raised, calling upon the Labour members in the House of Commons to press the Government to abolish all outwork and to compel manufacturers to provide factory room for all their employées. In a sense the National Anti-Sweating League were not responsible for this resolution; but it was a foregone conclusion that, when the League limited the delegates to the Societies named, some such resolution would be passed. It was passed unanimously, and Sir Charles Dilke, we believe, spoke in favour of it. We are then compelled to face the fact that the proposal to abolish all home industries has an influential and numerous backing, and a backing by people who know what they want and are not afraid to ask for it.

The very suggestion, however, of abolishing home work fills the writer with fear and indignation. One cannot but remember the hundreds of decent women—young widows and old widows, aged spinsters and wives with sick or unfortunate or even worthless husbands—who are fighting life's battle bravely, and who, though sparsely fed and

badly housed, are, at any rate, maintaining themselves in some fashion and exhibiting qualities which no workhouse could ever develop.

Let there be no mistake. If the State adopts this proposal, the street, the workhouse, or death by starvation, will be the doom of hundreds of noble women, and our workhouses will be filled with children. For who wants a weak, timid, elderly woman as a factory employée? Manufacturers do not, neither can they be compelled to engage her. The factory hours are limited, and rightly so; the old woman's movements are not quick enough to allow her to complete her 'tale' of work in the limited hours. The factory means liability for accident; and the old are particularly liable to accidents which the prompt movements of the young enable them to escape. The factory is no ideal place for the young, but it is an impossibility for the elderly. Have these poor women no claim to consideration? Have they any right to existence? The young widow, the bravely struggling single woman whose youth is past, the mother of little children, must knock at either the factory or workhouse door, with the positive certainty that they will get a rough reception at either when the door opens to the knock. This proposal is not only bad, but inhuman and stupid.

Secondly, we have the proposal that all 'outworkers' should be licensed. This is an old friend, and has been introduced to the House of Commons before, and will probably renew the acquaintance ere long.

But even in this proposal the *factory* is to be the dominating factor. Everyone who wishes to do some kind of home work is to apply to the factory inspector for a permit. This permission, or license, does not deal with the ability of the outworker, it has no reference whatever to the remuneration the worker is to receive, it takes no note of the hours that may be worked or of the age of the worker. It proposes only to judge of the cleanliness and suitability of the room in which the work is done.

This is an indifferent proposal, more absurd than mischievous. An illustration will shew how it will act. A



poor woman applies to the factory inspector for a license to make certain articles, the material for which she would obtain from a certain factory. He visits her home, finds it small, poor, and dirty but crowded with children; the ceiling is black, the walls are rotten, and the outlook from the window is into the wretched back premises. The inspector would refuse the license because of the insanitary condition of the room. And rightly so; but herein is a marvel: the room, not fit for the manufacture of match-boxes, is still fit for human habitation, for it is crowded day and night with children and adults. It seems to us that a visit from a conscientious sanitary inspector would be more to the purpose. But the factory inspector is to be allowed to give a temporary license conditional upon the improvement of the room within a specified time. Now comes the slum landlord's chance: he knows the poor woman's extremities, he 'does it up'; but he extracts his pound of flesh by raising the rent. Clearly the licensing suggestion thus regarded is of little value.

We now come to the third suggestion—the establishment of a *minimum wage*. From this great things have been expected, and it seems to be the one good suggestion in the field.

The proposal is to establish by legal enactment some machinery for fixing the lowest price at which the work may be done whether by factory hands or outworkers. A large influential society has been formed for advocating and developing the proposal. The National Anti-Sweating League for the Establishment of a Minimum Wage is, as we have said, the outcome of the exhibition held in May, and is supported by many ladies and gentlemen of standing, knowledge, and ability. The League has an organizing secretary, and we understand that local branches are being formed in many large towns. A Bill, which is backed by Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Percy Alden, and numerous other Members of Parliament, has been drafted and will be introduced into the House of Commons in April. This Bill is, we believe, identical, or practically identical, in its pro-

posals with the methods adopted some years since in New Zealand and parts of Australia.

The object of the Bill is to provide for the establishment of Wages Boards with power to fix the minimum rate of wages to be paid in any particular trade. Power is to be given to the Home Secretary to say to what trades the Act, if it becomes an Act, shall apply. The Wages Board is to be composed of an equal number of employers and employed, not less than four nor more than ten in all, with a chairman chosen by the members, or nominated by the Home Secretary. Any six persons employed in any trade in a given district—masters or workers—may apply to the Home Secretary for the establishment of a Board. Home work is to be calculated by the piece-work system, factory work by either the hour or piece. The Bill provides for the recovery of the deficiency in cases where persons are paid at a less rate than the fixed minimum which applies to them. The date fixed for the Bill to become law is January 1, 1908—next New Year's Day.

One can readily see how this will operate among factory hands and organized trades. If approached in a friendly spirit by employers and employed it will undoubtedly make for good, for many strikes with their attendant heartburnings and sufferings will be prevented, and the advantages of a fixed rate for a given time must be obvious to employers and their workers. But the difficulty comes when its provisions are sought by poor outworkers who need its protection the most. At present the poorest-paid industries are not included in the Bill; but supposing that the Home Secretary be induced to include match-box making in the list of scheduled trades, how are these workers, generally isolated bits of humanity, to take advantage of it and get the price of match-boxes considered by a Wages Board when no Board exists? The answer, of course, is that they must combine and apply to the Home Secretary for the establishment of a Board. Combination means time, courage, and money, and match-box makers have very little of either. For some years the writer has been trying to organize the poorest classes of home-workers; and,

although more than six hundred have joined his association, he knows how difficult a thing it is. The workers are afraid, and prefer the ills they have to the ills which they imagine would arise from a movement having for its aim an increase of pay. The manufacturer, they say, is not compelled to give them work, and they know only too well that, poor as their earnings are, plenty of women are waiting for the chance of taking their places. But a Wages Board ought to accomplish some good even for match-box makers, impossible though it appears. We would suggest to the framers of the Bill that some clause be added to allow of an outside person raising the question for, and appearing on behalf of, those engaged in the poorest and unorganized industries.

But, after all, legislation will not of itself abolish the evil, though it may do much in reducing it. Good done upon compulsion has not half the beneficent effect of good done for its own sake. Though it may ultimately be necessary for the poor workers to appeal to a properly constituted court against a reduction, or for a revision, of their pay, one would a hundred times prefer that employers, without waiting for compulsion, should take into consideration the position of their workers and make up their minds that the first charge upon the manufactured goods should be an equitable payment to their workers, be they men or women, young or old.

Public feeling is becoming awakened on the subject, and the writer is bold to affirm that any manufacturer, or retailer, who can give the public an assurance that his goods are made under indisputable conditions will not only command the market but will command his own price. For this assurance the country is waiting, and the first merchant who can give it will need no other advertisement.

It is beyond dispute that sweated work has a heavy curse upon it—cursing those who make, those who sell, and those who buy. Neither does the community go scot-free, for the effect of sweating spreads like a miasma carrying death along with it. Nor does it ultimately pay : sweated

work means poor work, in which there is no love and little interest ; it must pass muster, it does no more ; it is of necessity inferior work, and this fact ultimately has its influence on the business of manufacturer and retailer alike—it drags them down, too.

How unwise we are ! Some day perhaps we shall find that our truest wisdom will be to establish even women's work on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount ; but at present we do not realize the natural and Divine truth contained in the words ' With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.'

#### IV.

Sweating cannot be tackled in its entirety without due attention to the housing of the poor, of which question it is part and parcel. We are frequently told that the best way to raise the standard of life among the poor is to raise the standard of their earnings. It is greatly to be wished that money were more plentiful among the poor, but we are convinced that the only way permanently to raise their pay is to raise the standard of their lives. The writer may claim without boasting to have almost unique opportunities of learning how the poor live, and he knows how impossible it is for many of them to have any aspirations for real life.

All their surroundings tend to depression. One great lesson is forced upon them whichever way they turn : they are not of much account in the world ; anything is good enough for them. Contrast the streets of Kensington with the streets of East, North, and South London. Take notice of the cleanliness of the one and the dirt of the other. Even municipal bodies emphasize the lesson—excepting at election times. Railway companies enforce the same moral, as witness the railway stations of the West and those of East, South, and North London—any murky, dirty, uncomfortable place will serve as a station for the poor.

This lesson, as we have said, is forced upon the poor from every quarter, but it is forced upon them most of all



in their housing. In their homes they learn night and day that anything is good enough for the poor. We are of course speaking of those large masses of the London poor, the very poor, for whom as yet no provision approaching decency has been made, or attempted, either by private enterprise, municipal effort, or philanthropic trust. Decency and cleanliness, it might be thought in many slums, are not for the poor : they are the privileges of the well-to-do. The poor just rise to public expectation and not any higher. So it comes to pass that they are content with poor work, poor pay, poor food, bad air, and lack of decency. People living under these conditions fall an easy and a willing prey to the sweater. They have no power, they have no desire, to improve their environment and better their condition.

Their pay is reduced as well, without mutual arrangement between them and their employers ; and, although the State has ordered that a ' list of prices ' shall be exhibited prominently for the outworker to see, the State has not said that the employers shall not alter that list at will. ' That's the price I'm going to pay. Take the things or leave them as you like. I can get plenty of others to do them at the price.' So they take the work at reduced pay ; it only means another hour added to the many they work daily. But the matter does not end with these workers, for they drag down to their own level of pay their unfortunate and sorrowing sisters who have not yet got used to the worst conditions of sweated life.

Decent housing is, then, an essential if sweating is to be abolished. But who is to provide it ? Municipalities must have their five per cent. : philanthropic trusts must reap an equal profit ; Acts and trust deeds are stringent. Private enterprise wants a good deal more, and gets it. The poorer people are, the greater the burden of rent : the greater not only in proportion to their income, but the greater in proportion to the space occupied. Multiply a three-and-sixpenny room in Hoxton or Shoreditch till it becomes a villa residence in point of space, multiply the three-and-six at the same rate ; compare results, and you will find how hardly the poor are mulcted in rent.

In a Christian country one would think that people would be glad to invest their money in housing the poor and be content with three per cent. Why should it pay more than Consols? Good housing for the poor would be equally safe, for there is no prospect of the poor dying out at present. And the writer believes that such a housing project is not only not impossible but capable of being carried out in the near future; that if only public opinion can be aroused the time is at hand when the poor may be enabled to live in decency, cleanliness, and light, and when home industries will be conducted on fair principles.

We have already referred to the Home Workers' Aid Association, by which for some years an effort has been made to give rest, hope, and health to London's sweated women. Last year over three hundred of them went down to the sea and heard God's voice in the sound of many waters. The breath of God tingled in their nostrils and inflated their lungs, they paddled, they bathed, they laughed, they became again even as children. They joined in morning and evening prayers, they lay down in clean sheets, and woke with the songs of birds in their ears. They anxiously scanned the glass to see if the kiss of the sun and the caress of the wind had coloured them, and they were proud of the touch of bronze on the cheeks that had never previously known it. And they came back to London—and opened their windows.

This year, we hope that double the number of women will be able to go to their rest-house by the sea.

The association has forty poor widows, mostly with children, but some are old; to each one it says, 'Thou shalt not work on Sunday, but thou shalt keep thine house clean'; if they will fulfil these conditions a monthly pension, which even if small is a help, is allowed to them. Day trips to Epping Forest or the country, social teas and concerts, visitation of the sick, and sometimes help at death: these are the means which the Association employs to make these people realize that they are not cut off altogether from humanity.

But, after all, these are means to one great end—com-

bination for living decently and an ascent from the Inferno to reasonable life. And this includes a housing scheme for which the land has already been acquired. On twelve acres of pretty country, not far out, will be a colony of home workers. Every window will look upon a beautiful garden ; every room will be lit by electric light and will be properly heated ; no smoky chimney will pollute the sweet air ; no filthy dustbins will stand in horrible backyards ; every set of rooms will have perfect sanitation ; and no rotten plaster will line shoddy walls. In this village the inhabitants will have their own stores and their own restaurant. One clean nourishing meal every day, at a little over cost price, will be provided for them ; small gas stoves will boil their kettles or cook their ' rashers ' in their own kitchens. In their living rooms no unpleasant work will be done, for workrooms will be provided absolutely apart from the home and the sickly smell of paste and fish-glue, and other evil odours, will no longer be part and parcel of their home life. Nor will their ' washing ' be done in their own rooms ; for washhouses and drying rooms will form part of the village equipment.

The village will have its distinctive badge, and this badge will be a pledge to the world that all articles bearing its impress have been made in decency and cleanliness and paid for also with some approach to justice. Thus better prices will be obtained and fewer hours will be worked. And hope will come again into desolate hearts, and children will play and weary women will rest in the village that is to be.

It is not a mere dream of an impossible Utopia. The land is bought for this village and the money is ready for its building and equipment. Poor struggling women, who now wash their clothing at midnight and dry it in their murky rooms, are to be its inhabitants. And it is to be an object-lesson—for its foundations will be laid in justice and common-sense, and its walls builded in decency and equity. And, so builded, the writer dares to assert that it will *pay*. It will pay the kind friend who is providing the money his three per cent. ; pay the manufacturers who have their

goods made in the village; and pay the public who buy those goods. But most of all, and best of all, it will pay the poor sweated women; for rest will come to them, and hope, long absent from their hearts, will revive, clean food will invigorate them, fresh air will send the blood coursing through their veins, and the merry voices of their children will be music to them.

And it is safe to assert that if it does pay it will not stand alone; for other villages will follow. The poor must combine and must be helped to combine if they are to exist. Under the present conditions, and living on the present plan, their lives are too dreadful, too wasteful, too degrading for words.

Justice, brotherly love, science and decency have scarcely as yet begun to play their part in the lives of these poor. It is not a question of setting class against class, still less is it one more scheme of pauperization under the name of philanthropy. It is an attempt to bring before the eyes of those who would help, if they only knew how, the exceeding greatness of the need and a suggestion of a method by which something may be done to cope with it on economic principles. It will be the best reward of all those who share in it to have been able to shew something of the meaning of Christian love to the downtrodden and oppressed section of the women workers of London.

THOMAS HOLMES.

---



## ART. VII.—EURIPIDES AND HIS MODERN INTERPRETERS.

1. *Euripides the Rationalist* (1895). *Four Plays of Euripides* (1906). By A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D. (Cambridge University Press.)
2. *Euripide et l'Esprit de son Théâtre.* By PAUL DECHARME. (Paris: Garnier, 1894.)
3. *The Moral Standpoint of Euripides.* By W. H. S. JONES, of Selwyn College, Cambridge. (London: Blackie, 1906.)
4. *Translations of Euripides* (*Hippolytus, Bacchae, Troades, &c.*). By GILBERT MURRAY. (London: G. Allen, 1903-7.)
5. *Balaustion's Adventure. Aristophanes' Apology.* By ROBERT BROWNING. (London: Smith, Elder.)

THE 'sweet uses of adversity' are telling very favourably at the present time on Hellenic studies in general, and on that of the Greek drama in particular. Never, probably, has the utility of Greek been more widely questioned than it is to-day, and seldom, if ever, has the study itself been more vigorously pursued. The apparent paradox needs little or no explanation. So long as Greek was regarded as something mysterious but essential to every type of mind that could possibly be brought into touch with it, the study of it languished through being superstitiously regarded. But now that the urgent claims of science and modern languages have made themselves heard even in what are sometimes described as the antique homes of classicism, and unwise heads begin to 'despair of the Republic,' more sagacious teachers and thinkers realize that Greek will live and thrive, not as a badly enforced mystery but as a supremely rich literature. It is not, perhaps, past hope, but it is past probability, that we shall recover from Egypt, or Herculaneum, or elsewhere, the lost treasures of the Greek lyric muse. It is through lyrics that we first fall in love with our own or any other language: Wordsworth's 'lyric cry' for the discovery of some fresh 'tender-hearted scroll from pure Simonides' must have been re-echoed by many a scholar and teacher, doomed at present to teach boys Greek by fragments of

dramatic wholes which as fragments are apt to be desperately dull. Not enough use, perhaps, is made, for the young, of the *Anthologia*, from which an ideal book of *excerpta* might be readily compiled; such collections indeed exist, but they have not passed into the ordinary curriculum, we hardly know why. Even if they should do so, they would fall short of the lyric charm which leads on ingenuous youth, from lesser but complete poems, to the larger wholes of the epic or the drama. The most signal feature in the study of Greek literature during the last quarter of a century has been, without doubt, the rehabilitation of Euripides. It is not that his great predecessor Æschylus, and his elder contemporary Sophocles, have been thrust down from 'pride of place' or deprived of their respective crowns; nothing of the sort has happened nor seems likely to happen. But there has grown up a strong indisposition to measure the Greek dramatists by mere comparison; and the idea that Euripides is a second-rate poet, easier and therefore more fit for youthful students as a stepping-stone to higher things, is felt to be one of those quarter-truths which may well 'suffer not thinking on.' After all, and with whatever limitations we render, in English, the judgement of Aristotle that 'Euripides, faulty as he is in the general management of his subject, yet is felt to be the most tragic of poets,'<sup>1</sup> the *dictum* is incompatible with that half-contemptuous attitude towards the poet which so long prevailed among us, and led even men of genius astray; *pace* Mr. Swinburne, the 'most tragic of poets' was not 'a huckster of pathos whose gift was insipid ease.' The hour for awakening was bound to come, but it was attended by circumstances of special interest, and followed by a fortunate combination of critical genius and poetic gift. Nearly thirty-five years ago, the famous picture of 'Death and Heracles contending for the body of Alcestis,' and the judicious pressure of an admirer, induced Browning to translate the *Alcestis* in a setting of his own. Three years later, he followed up the adventure of Balaustion with the beautiful narrative of her later history, inserting in the course of it his version

<sup>1</sup> *Poetics*, c. xiii., Mr. Butcher's translation.

of the *Heracles Mainomenos*. The memorable portraiture of Aristophanes added a special interest to a volume which, owing to its learned complexities, is even now inadequately appreciated; the quaint fanaticism which led him to translate the *Agamemnon* into a sort of stiff English facsimile was of dubious service to the Greek drama, but *Balaustion's Adventure*, and *Aristophanes' Apology*, with their appended versions of two Euripidean dramas, were noble auxiliaries to the reviving fame of Euripides, after a long period of comparative depreciation. The beautiful story of the homage paid by the aged Sophocles to his dead rival is well known; but Browning's noble reproduction of it is, perhaps, less familiar than it deserves to be, owing to the mass of obscure learning in which it is embedded. The Aristophanes banquet is in full swing, with the customary derision of the absent Euripides, when 'something happens':

' Enters an old pale-swathed majesty,  
Makes slow mute passage through two ranks as mute . . .  
Grey brow still bent on ground, upraised at length  
When, our Priest reached, full-front the vision paused.  
" Priest ! "—the deep tone succeeded the fixed gaze—  
" Thou carest that thy god have spectacle  
Decent and seemly; wherefore, I announce  
That, since Euripides is dead to-day,  
My Choros, at the Greater Feast, next month,  
Shall, clothed in black, appear ungarlanded ! "  
Then the grey brow sank low, and Sophokles  
Re-swathed him, sweeping doorward : mutely passed  
Twixt rows as mute, to mingle possibly  
With certain gods who convoy age to port ;  
And night resumed him.'

It is not, of course, implied that the study of Euripides had been wholly neglected in England until the early seventies of the last century. But beyond question it had been depreciated; his poetry had been regarded as specially suitable for schoolboys, as a stepping-stone to the higher things of Æschylus and Sophocles, as something useful, but comparatively easy and transitory. It was a complete misconception, and led to some results which

were not quite harmless. The *Medea* and the *Hippolytus* are noble dramas, but they are not specially well suited to early adolescence ; the *Hecuba* was better, and the *Alcestis*, though, as we now know from Dr. Verrall, its real gist was unrecognized, had a simple charm which fitted it for the young. The opening scene of the *Ion* is one of the gems of Greek literature, and especially attractive to intelligent boyhood, but it was seldom put before them ; the background of the story seems to have scandalized teachers of youth who saw no objection to the *Hippolytus*. The *Bacchae*, for no very obvious reason, was almost unread ; so was the *Troades*. But the plain truth is that Euripides is not a very satisfactory poet for the education of the young, and quite the worst possible for being dropped at the age when we begin Sophocles or Æschylus. His theology, or anti-theology, his attitude towards the legends which he dramatizes, the background of his mind, the melancholy whisper which constantly seems to sound in our ears—*I think there are no gods, but I am sure there are not wicked ones*—the mixture in him, as Mr. Gilbert Murray excellently says, ‘ of unshrinking realism with unshrinking imaginativeness ’—all these things mark out Euripides as definitely a poet for mature readers : *not* for ingenuous youth, which demands and deserves, above all things, a simple plot and point of view. It is fortunate, therefore, that the remarkable revival of interest in Euripides, which Browning did so much to arouse, found, before many years had elapsed, a commentator and interpreter of genius, and again, a little later, the most poetical of translators. Dr. Verrall will probably not resent our saying that his early work upon Horace, and his edition of the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, were not free from the genial fault of speculative audacity. Like a personage in *Pickwick*, he rather aspired to ‘ make our flesh creep,’ by ingenious hypotheses which, to a generation brought up on Paley’s commentary, seemed not only agitating but heterodox in the extreme. In so far as they were really extravagant, we may say, in the words of the poet himself—if indeed they are his—

‘ Time cleanseth all things, growing old therewith.’



But, on the other hand, ingenuity of *interpretation*, in dealing with an ancient and difficult work like Æschylus' masterpiece, is far too valuable to be thrust aside in mere timidity; and indeed no small number of these apparent audacities have commended themselves more and more to common-sense, as the shock of them wore off. But a larger aspiration still, and its partial fulfilment in the two volumes, *Euripides the Rationalist* and *Four Plays of Euripides*, have made Dr. Verrall protagonist in a great cause—to wit, the recovery of the Euripidean point of view. It is clear that the poet's own generation recognized his divergence from the common creeds and national prejudices of the day; they understood that he was countermining the current conceptions, especially in the matter of religion and, to some extent, of politics. Mr. Gilbert Murray, in his excellent chapter on 'Euripides,'<sup>1</sup> puts the case very well, when he tells us that, alike against the orthodoxy of the day and against a shallow rationalism, Euripides is

'a solitary rebel. He is seldom frankly and outspokenly sceptical; *when he is so, it is always on moral grounds* . . . For the most part, Euripides is far from frank on these subjects. The majority of the plays draw no conclusions, but only suggest premisses. They state the religious traditions very plainly, and leave the audience to judge if it believes in them or approves of them. His work left on his contemporaries, and, if intelligently read, leaves on us, an impression of uneasy, half-disguised hostility to the supernatural element which plays so large a part in it.'

The position is so clear and comprehensible that it seems strange that so much difficulty has been found in grasping it. Many convinced theists, we presume, and many ardent Christians, stand in exactly the same attitude towards the God of Calvinism.

But in speaking of Dr. Verrall as 'protagonist' in the rehabilitation of Euripides, we allude rather to his concentration on his great theme than to anything isolated in his efforts. Of Mr. Gilbert Murray we have spoken already, and must speak of him again in his capacity of translator.

<sup>1</sup> *Ancient Greek Literature*, pp. 265-6.

Scholars and theologians—notably the late Bishop Westcott—have dealt with Euripides; the late John Addington Symonds has expounded, in his own flowery style but soundly and eloquently, the position of Euripides in art and literature.<sup>1</sup> Goethe himself not only refused his assent to the theory that Euripides caused the decline of Greek tragedy, but energetically added that ‘if a modern man like Schlegel must pick out faults in so great an ancient as Euripides, he ought only to do it on his knees.’ Few readers, it may be confidently hoped, fail to perceive the triple golden thread of reminiscence in the words put in the mouth of Balaustion:

‘I know the poetess who graved in gold,  
Among her glories that shall never fade,  
This style and title for Euripides,  
*The Human with his droppings of warm tears.*’

Among recent men, Professor Paul Decharme (whose valuable work, *Euripide et l'Esprit de son Théâtre*, has been recently translated into English) is spoken of by Dr. Verrall<sup>2</sup> as having written ‘the best treatise on the poet with which I am acquainted.’ A very compendious little book of some thirty pages—*The Moral Standpoint of Euripides*—has just been published by Mr. W. H. S. Jones, of Selwyn College, Cambridge. It is full of information, but—doubtless owing to its compression—somewhat too peremptory in style.

Still, Dr. Verrall’s two volumes represent a unique effort to reclaim for Euripides the place among poets which the ancient world never dreamed of denying to him, and which, in modern times, has never been conceded. As Dr. Verrall says: ‘Agreeing generally, with remarkable but not surprising exactness, in their estimate of the great writers Greek and Roman, about this one man the ancient readers and the modern are out of accord.’ His two volumes are a prolonged and ingenious effort to pull the balance true, by reforming our modern notions of the poet’s point of view. To put the matter with the extremest

<sup>1</sup> *Studies of the Greek Poets*, vol. ii.

<sup>2</sup> *Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 81.

brevity, the dramatic legends of Greece, and especially their theological incidents, were to Euripides words and wind ; things no more *true*, historically speaking, than the incidents of a dream are historical occurrences.

‘ The creed of Euripides ’ (says Dr. Verrall) ‘ was that of nascent philosophy, science, and rationalism ; between which and the worship of the popular gods there was a war to which modern religious controversies offer no parallel. . . . That it was the purpose and effect of his plays to destroy the old religious beliefs is repeatedly taken by Aristophanes for notorious. To dwell upon the evidence is unnecessary, as, if not quite undisputed, it is not really open to reasonable dispute . . . there is scarcely one of the extant plays which would not prove him a determined enemy of the popular theology.’

But then, on the other hand, Euripides was a poet ; the stage-plays at Athens were Religion, the Press, and public opinion combined, and to abstract the theological element from these spectacles was impossible, and the attempt to do so would have been dangerous. *Fixed* belief, indeed, in these divine personalities had waned since the days of Æschylus, but reverence for a certain range of ideas, especially if they are to be embodied before the public gaze, long outlives any positive belief in the hierarchy which they are supposed to represent. Euripides had before him the hard task—if he was to be a dramatist at all—of using materials which he held to be fictitious, introducing deities in whom he totally disbelieved, and adjusting miraculous and preposterous legends to a rationalistic interpretation in which, and in which alone, he felt that possibly some reality, some basis of truth, might be found. He saw, and brilliantly exhibited, the dramatic possibilities of the legends of Alcestis and Heracles ; but while with the poetic side of his nature he wrote a drama the simple pathos of which, and its happy ending, have been the joy of many generations, he would not conceal, from any intelligent Athenian, any more than he can from the scrutiny of Dr. Verrall, his real attitude towards the story of Alcestis’ death and resurrection. Here as elsewhere—*e.g.* in the *Ion*, and in the *Heracles Mainomenos*—he cannot dwell in comfort,

as Æschylus and Sophocles could, with the legends he dramatized. The rationalist in him will out, in spite of all conventional and traditional beliefs: the brutality and incontinence of Apollo is not part of his creed, but his way of shewing that, to his mind, no such deity existed; that Delphi was a fraud, and Hermes a liar; and that gods (upon the stage) always come in to muffle truth, which only men and women can or will tell.

This temper of mind does, we think, remove Euripides from the company which otherwise he was so worthy to join—the company of ‘*serene* creators of immortal things.’ Serenity, and something of ‘the wise indifference of the wise,’ were wanting to that impatient and saddened spirit. He could not possess his soul in patience, nor solace himself, as Shakespeare did, by concealment of his personality and creed, in the pure joy of creativeness. To Euripides, the vision of the future was dark, and the interpreters of it were a fraud:

‘The prophet’s art, I do perceive,  
Is a thing worthless, full of lying guile!  
There comes no help, no wisdom in the flare  
Of sacrifice, nor in the cry of birds!  
An idle dream it is, that fowls of air  
Can aid mankind!’

We cannot fully agree with Mr. W. H. S. Jones when he says (in the little volume already cited) that ‘perhaps no literature is so pessimistic as Greek literature; certainly no Greek writer is so pessimistic as Euripides,’ and gives (among other illustrations) the famous line from the *Alcestis*

‘Life is not life, but mere calamity.’

A reference to the context disposes of the illustration with comical completeness. But we do think that the depreciation of Euripides in modern times, which Dr. Verrall speaks of so wisely in his Introduction, and combats so vigorously in both his Euripidean volumes, is in some degree due to the poet’s querulous tone. It is wearisome to hear so constantly that luck is against human life. That the gods must be either knavish or non-existent may be a



sound and justifiable persuasion, but it is the fate of constant negatives that those who utter them drift into a *doctrinaire* attitude which alienates the lovers of poetry. The 'modern' depreciation of Euripides is only in part based upon his 'anti-theism': in so far as it has that basis, it deserves no particular respect and no special anathema—it is a theological judgement, not a literary one. But Dr. Verrall, who sees Euripides steadily and sees him whole, has not, we think, quite realized that the modern readers who failed to acquiesce in the poet's ancient renown, fully felt his pathos, but thought his choric odes (with a few notable exceptions) somewhat thin. Their judgement may have been wrong, but it was neither prejudiced nor, in itself, unreasonable.

We know not how much further Dr. Verrall means to carry his Euripidean 'studies.' In his first volume, *Euripides the Rationalist*, he has dealt with three complete dramas—*Alcestis*, *Ion*, *Iphigenia*—and added two supplementary studies, *Euripides in a Hymn*, and *Last Scene of All*—the latter bearing on the *Phoenissae*. Owing to the widespread familiarity of many besides professional scholars with the first-mentioned play (it has been repeatedly acted in the original language, and its echoes must ever be haunting the beautiful theatrical chalk-pit of Bradfield College!) and to the very full speculative interpretation given to it by Dr. Verrall, it is perhaps the most important of the essays. But, with its two companions, it has been before the public for ten years, and, for Euripides, has supplemented the service which *Balaustion's Adventure* began. The new volume deals with four plays—*Andromache*, *Helen*, *Heracles Mainomenos*, and *Orestes*. The first-mentioned play, in spite of some incidental beauties, has never told its own tale with any lucidity, and few will be found to doubt that Dr. Verrall is right in viewing it as explicable only on the hypothesis that it is a 'second volume,' the first having been lost, and, with it, the key by which the confused puzzle of the *Andromache* would have been plain to us. That this is so, is clear, not only in the abstract certainty that Euripides, master of subtlety as he was, never wrote a

disordered or unintelligible play, but also from the Greek 'argument' prefixed to the play and ascribed, rightly or wrongly, to Aristophanes of Alexandria. In this 'argument,' the words τὸ δὲ δράμα τῶν δευτέρων seem to give a clue to the mystery. That the words should mean 'Now the play is second-rate' is almost impossible: that they mean 'The play took the second prize' is improbable, the Greek idiom to express that being well known. Dr. Verrall is clearly right in rendering the phrase, 'It is a *sequel*-play,' and explaining the situation by an ingenious parallel. To treat the *Andromache* as an independent whole is 'as if we were to expound and estimate *Catriona* . . . without knowing or suspecting that there had ever been such a story as *Kidnapped*.' But, in this case, the loss is real: we have to *imagine* the first volume of the dramatic story of *Andromache*, which Dr. Verrall re-christens *A Greek Borgia* in reference to the cool depravity of Menelaus' proceedings. The second of the four plays, known to readers of Euripides as the *Helen* but styled by Dr. Verrall, for sufficient reasons, *Euripides' Apology*, is treated in the essayist's most ingenious and imaginative style. The 'sufficient reasons' are, briefly, these. The play is, in almost every point, not only unlike, but contradictory to, the normal mood of Euripides. There is not a word against the gods; on the contrary, they all seem to be doing their not very intelligent best. Helen herself is innocent, and, in pressing circumstances, retires into a nunnery, or, to be quite exact, 'has taken up her abode in the late King Proteus' mausoleum.' The *phantom* Helen, in recovering whom Menelaus has spent long years and spilled much blood, under the illusion that she is real, is eventually brought by him to Egypt, where the real Helen is guarding herself, by seclusion, from the attentions of Theoclymenus, the late King Proteus' son. Thereon the phantom Helen, finding herself literally *de trop*, melts into air, after the necessary explanation: Menelaus and Helen borrow a ship by a ruse, from Theoclymenus, and depart for Greece, almost literally to the sound of wedding bells!

Nothing less like Euripides' other work and general

attitude of mind can possibly be conceived : yet there is not the slightest ground for doubting its authorship, and *some* explanation of Euripides' unexpected recantation of his normal point of view is certainly required. Dr. Verrall has one, so ingeniously worked out as to be almost persuasive and yet almost as pure a piece of fantasy as the phantom-Helen herself. To be brief, he thinks the *Helen*—or, as he calls it, *Euripides' Apology*—is a melodrama, a Midsummer Night's Dream, written at the request of a kind of ladies' college, in connexion with the festival of the Thesmophoria, and acted or recited before this female audience in an island (Macris or *Helene*) near the shores of Attica. Hence the unusual *piety* of the play, and the abnegation of the poet's tendency to misogyny, may be accounted for ! What solid weight should be given to this ingenious speculation, *iudicent lectores* ; but a more fascinating piece of constructive hypothesis and humorous guesswork we might go far to seek.

The third play, *Heracles*—re-named *A Soul's Tragedy*—is a very much grimmer piece of work, not only in the original but in the essayist's treatment of it. Euripides, he thinks, saw and sketched in *Heracles* a real case of a noble nature with a taint of insanity, breaking into a momentary and murderous frenzy. The delusions about his labours—only half-believed by himself—are thus accounted for from the Euripidean point of view, and subtly commented on by the essayist. Nothing, we think, in the *Heracles*, will quite justify the exordium with which Balaustion, in *Aristophanes' Apology*, preludes her recitation of this drama :

‘ Accordingly I read the perfect piece.’

It is *not* a perfect piece : it is something less than that, but it is a very strong and interesting effort, in a field where perhaps only *Æschylus* and *Shakespeare* have fully succeeded.

The fourth and last play—*Orestes*, otherwise *A Fire from Hell*—is, we are told (Introd. p. xi), more read than any of the other three. The special dramatic popularity of the

legends of the family of Agamemnon may account for this. The *Orestes* is a fine but lurid play, and presents the passion of revenge in an undoubtedly ugly and ferocious aspect. We are not clear that Euripides intended—as the essayist thinks he did—to describe Orestes as an infuriated young ruffian, totally without character or scruple, and Electra as a vixenish and ferocious old maid, maddened by the disgrace and disappointment of not having married! This last element in the case rouses no such emotion as Dr. Verrall feels against Euripides' *Electra*, when we meet it in the *Electra* of Sophocles. No doubt Euripides brings down emotions of this sort till they seem of the earth, earthy; that is his way, his mission, his mood. But Dr. Verrall views the passion of revenge, as exhibited by Orestes and Electra, after unexampled wrongs, not as of the earth, earthy, but as—well, in view of the title he has given to the play, let us say subterranean! It is the only case in which, amid all the ingenious audacities of his dramatic speculations, he seems momentarily to have lost the fine balance of his judgement.

We have indicated that the reviving fame of Euripides has owed, and is owing, much to an *interpreter* of genius: by the double good fortune already alluded to, he has met also with a translator of exceptional powers. Professor Murray has the advantage, which he shares with Dr. Verrall, of knowing the ground of Greek drama thoroughly, and also of writing exquisite English verse-translations, in which he does not fear to expand the letter, if thereby he can preserve the spirit, of a Greek choric ode or dramatic speech. Is it possible, *e.g.*, to put the pathos of the Chorus' lament for the doomed Phaedra (*Hippol.* ll. 762–774) more truly and more powerfully than this?—

And for that dark spell that about her clings,  
Sick desires of forbidden things

The soul of her rend and sever;

The bitter tide of calamity

Hath risen above her lips; and she

Where bends she her last endeavour?

She will hie her alone to her bridal room,

And a rope swing slow in the rafters' gloom;



And a fair white neck shall creep to the noose,  
 A-shudder with dread, yet firm to choose  
 The one strait way for fame, and lose  
 The Love and the pain for ever.'

The farewell of Artemis to the dying Hippolytus—given by Professor Murray in the rhymed couplets which he prefers to blank verse as an equivalent for the Iambic measure—is excellent also :

'Yea, and to thee, for this sore travail's sake,  
 Honours most high in Troezên will I make ;  
 For yokeless maids before their bridal night  
 Shall shear for thee their tresses ; and a rite  
 Of honouring tears be thine in ceaseless store ;  
 And virgins' thoughts in music evermore  
 Turn toward thee, and praise thee in the Song  
 Of Phædra's far-famed love and thy great wrong. .  
 And thou, Hippolytus, shrink not from the King,  
 Thy father. Thou wast born to bear this thing.  
 Farewell ! I may not watch man's fleeting breath,  
 Nor stain mine eyes with the effluence of death.  
 And sure that Terror now is very near.'

There is something in Mr. Gilbert Murray's verse which goes far beyond a happy knack of translation : *διὰ Μούσας καὶ μετάρσιος ἤξεν* would perhaps be the verdict of Euripides, borrowing a phrase of his own, on his translator.

Euripides has suffered, in life and in death, from irrational enmities and inevitable misunderstandings. Not without friction and unpopularity can any writer habitually controvert the professed creed—however lightly held—of the national audience : such a position leads to bitterness and to exile, literal or spiritual. But when the excellent mockery of Aristophanes—which is commonly taken as far more serious and malicious than it was intended to be—has said its say and laughed its laugh, the real rank of Euripides as a poet must be sought elsewhere. The great dramatic poets of the world should not be ranked as in a class-list, but viewed as a cluster of stars. Is there any reasonable canon or criterion by which Euripides can be excluded

from their company? Let the great modern poet whose appreciation has done so much for the renewal of Euripides' fame, speak the reconciling word:

'He lies now in the little valley, laughed  
And moaned about by those mysterious streams,  
Boiling and freezing, like the love and hate  
Which helped or harmed him through his earthly course.  
They mix in Arethousa by his grave.'

E. D. A. MORSHEAD.

#### ART. VIII.—THE GOSPEL HISTORY AND ITS TRANSMISSION.

1. *The Gospel History and its Transmission.* By F. CRAWFORD BURKITT, M.A., F.B.A., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.)
2. *The Human Element in the Gospels.* A Commentary on the Synoptic Narrative. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., F.R.S., late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. Edited by NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's, and Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin. (London: John Murray, 1907.)
3. *Silanus the Christian.* By EDWIN A. ABBOTT. (London: A. & C. Black, 1906.)
4. *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons.* Von Lic. theol. Dr. phil. JOHANNES LEIPOLDT, Privatdozent an der Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Erster Teil. *Die Entstehung.* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907.)
5. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Von ADOLF HARNACK. I. *Lukas der Arzt:* der Verfasser des Dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.)

6. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Von ADOLF HARNACK. II. *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*: die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907.)
7. *Agrapha Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente.* Gesammelt und untersucht und in zweiter völlig neu bearbeiteter durch Alttestamentliche Agrapha vermehrter Auflage herausgegeben von ALFRED RESCH. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.)
8. *The Fifth Gospel.* Being the Pauline Interpretation of the Christ. By the Author of *The Faith of a Christian.* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1907.)
9. *Egypt Exploration Fund.* Report of the Twentieth Ordinary General Meeting, 1905-6. (Sold at the Offices of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 37 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.)

THE present year has already produced an unusual number of interesting works on a subject which must be of perennial and vital interest to all our readers—the Gospel History—and we propose to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded us to review modern speculation on the subject.

Mr. Burkitt's book, which we have placed at the head of our list, has all the merit which we expect from him. It is fresh, attractive, original, and reverent. Mr. Burkitt is a sincere critic and an equally sincere Christian, and he gives strong and good reasons for the reconciliation of his Christianity with his criticism. We shall find ourselves obliged to criticize some of his conclusions very frankly. He suffers, we believe, from the danger of a somewhat excessive desire for originality, which makes him underestimate the strength of old-fashioned arguments and lay undue stress on new ones. But we wish at the outset to thank him for the tone and temper of his book, and for the help which he has given us towards the great problem which has to be worked out at the present day—the reconciliation of critical freedom and religious belief.

The next two books are profoundly interesting works by two English theologians of an older generation. Dr.

Salmon's posthumous work on *The Human Element in the Gospels* shews the wonderful freshness of his intellect in his old age. He has preserved his originality, he has discarded the somewhat polemical character of his earlier works, and has attacked the Gospel problem in a purely scientific spirit. His work suffers, no doubt, from not having received his final touches ; it is, perhaps, doubtful whether a third revision might not have led to further modification of his views ; but it is one more proof that a clear vigorous mind may preserve its keenness and originality to the end of life. May we add that it makes one more debt that liberal learning owes to the great College of the Undivided Trinity in Dublin which the present Government desire to mutilate ? In an exceedingly interesting preface Dr. Salmon notices the change which had taken place in his own methods and the advantages that he feels have been the result :

' For my own feelings, the books of the Gospels had a sacredness which Old Testament books had not ; and it was painful to me to lay aside those feelings of reverence which had hitherto deterred me from too minute investigation. I felt as if I had been set to make a dissection of the body of my mother ; and could not feel that the scientific value of the results I might obtain would repay me for the painful shock resulting from the very nature of the task.'

But, in spite of this, he finds the work fascinating and the result satisfactory :

' I have found nothing more interesting than this work of turning dead records into living history, as I tried to throw myself into the feelings and attitude of mind of those men of old whose story I read.'

' If I can recommend the study to others who have patience for it, it is because I consider that it gives us a firmer hold of the reality of the facts of the Gospel history.'

' The best defence of the study of the human element in the Gospels is that this human element is the real foundation of our faith. . . . We shall find that in the last resort we come to depend on the human element in the Gospels, that is to say, on things that can be proved by ordinary historical testimony.'



Dr. Abbott, from his retreat at Hampstead, continues to give us the result of his acute—perhaps over-acute—investigations.<sup>1</sup> His *Silanus the Christian* is a work of great interest. As literature it shews high qualities as an imaginative reconstruction of the strength and weakness of second century Stoicism. No doubt it is marred, from a literary point of view, by the mass of over-subtle speculation as to the development of the Gospel narrative with which it is burdened. No doubt, from the historical point of view, it suffers from the modernness of the speculations. No writer in the second century could have felt the critical difficulties which Dr. Abbott feels. Its real interest is the light that it throws on Dr. Abbott's own mental position. It is to us important as the best illustration of a critical and religious attitude with which we cannot agree, but from which we differ with profound respect.

Compared with these three brilliant books the German works which follow, however meritorious, are decidedly commonplace. Dr. Leipoldt's *History of the Canon* is an excellent specimen of the more sober and workmanlike German scholarship. He knows his literature, and he sums up his views clearly and succinctly. He is conservative in tone, largely indebted, we should gather, to the writings of Zahn even more than to Harnack, and he will often provide a useful corrective to Mr. Burkitt's somewhat adventurous speculation. Dr. Harnack's work on 'Luke the physician,' is really a tribute to English scholarship. It is surprising how little those who talk most glibly of scientific methods in criticism recognize where scientific methods are really to be found. It is becoming increasingly clear that the *Horae Synopticae* of Sir John Caesar Hawkins, and the patient and scientific methods of work which he follows, present the most solid contribution which recent years have made to New Testament criticism, and Dr. Harnack's aim is to

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Salmon's criticism on him is somewhat severe. 'A scholar of wonderful ingenuity and even more astonishing absence of common sense. He seems to have lately made considerable acquaintance with Hebrew, and, like a boy with a new knife, goes about hacking everything with it.' *The Human Element*, p. 312.

introduce these methods to German readers ; yet Sir John Hawkins, who is only a retired country clergyman, has never received, so far as we are aware, any public or academic recognition, and those who are most anxious to instruct the public in scientific criticism will continue to prefer the more showy and speculative writers, who may be critical but are certainly not scientific. The second work of Dr. Harnack, an attempt to reconstruct the common stories of St. Mark and St. Luke, is much more speculative in character ; but here, again, it represents a marked advance, and an attempt is made, though not, we think, very successfully, to control somewhat uncertain investigation by the more accurate methods of linguistic analysis.

*The Fifth Gospel*, by the author of *The Faith of a Christian*, is an attractive work which is useful for our present purpose, as it reminds us of the evidence in favour of the historical character of Christ, apart from and independent of the particular theories we may hold about the Gospel narrative.

With the assistance of these books we propose to ask what answers are being given at the present day to the following questions :

1. The formation of the Canon of the Gospels.
2. The actual date of the Gospels.
3. The materials out of which they were constructed and their historical value.
4. The bearing of these conclusions on the truth of Christianity.

## I.

‘ There cannot be more Gospels than these four, nor can there be fewer. For as there are four regions of the world in which we live and four principal winds, and the Church is disseminated over all the world, and the Gospel is the pillar and foundation of the Church and the spirit which gives it life, it results that it must have four pillars breathing forth incorruptibility from all sides and giving life to men. . . . Fourfold are the beasts of the divine vision, fourfold is the Gospel, fourfold is the divine order. Wherefore four also were the covenants with the human race.’<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III. xi. 11 (ed. Harvey).

In these well-known words Irenaeus, writing shortly after the year 180, sums up for us the belief of his day concerning the Gospel canon. His arguments for the four-fold Gospel are not, perhaps, convincing in character, and some critics who have misunderstood the thought of the day have considered his testimony to be as unsubstantial as his reasoning. It is forgotten by such critics that arguments such as these do not, it is true, afford us any adequate reason for accepting only Four Gospels, but they give extremely convincing proof that Four Gospels were accepted. Irenaeus could have found equally convincing arguments in favour of three, or two, or seven Gospels, but the arguments prove that Four Gospels were already part of the ecclesiastical tradition which he defends in a manner which appealed to his own time. If Irenaeus could write like this (and his testimony is corroborated by that of all his contemporaries), it is obvious that the Four Gospels must have occupied this unique position for at least a generation, and any knowledge that we have supports this inference. So Mr. Burkitt writes :

‘From about 170 A.D. onwards the Gospel Canon enjoys practically unchallenged supremacy, as we see from Tatian’s Harmony, from the document known as the Muratorian Canon, and from S. Irenaeus. Somewhat earlier than Tatian must be placed an interpolated edition of the Four Gospels, which seems to have been set forth in Rome, and from which the more important “Western Interpolations” in Greek and Latin Biblical MSS. are ultimately derived. This brings us back to about 150 ; but the literary history of our Gospels during the first half of the second century is unknown. Justin Martyr doubtless used all the Four in Rome about the middle of the century, and Marcion certainly used Luke about 130–140. Earlier still are the allusions which indicate a use of Matthew by S. Ignatius.’

We quote these words not only because they take us back to the acceptance of the Four Gospels about 150, but because they remind us of old controversies and the advances in historical certainty which have been made by means of criticism. We remember how it was once asserted that Tatian did not know Four Gospels, and that the

*Diatessaron* had nothing to do with Four ; how Justin was supposed to have obtained his theology from every source but the obvious one—that of St. John's Gospel ; how Marcion was alleged to have used the original Luke which Catholic writers interpolated. These statements, once imposed upon us as critical certainties, seem now like phantoms of the past. By the year 150 our Four Gospels were recognized in the Church, and they were quoted as Scripture, and we can hardly feel that much stress can be laid on Mr. Burkitt's argument that Justin did not think very highly of the Gospels because he quoted them inaccurately, when we remember the character of the quotations from the Old Testament made by Christian writers from St. Paul onwards.

This, then, is our starting-point. Our Four Gospels were accepted as Scripture in the year 150. How far back can we go in the history of the New Testament Canon ? We will begin by examining Mr. Burkitt's theory. It is not perhaps novel, but is stated by him with much freshness of manner. The early Christian Church, he contends, took very little interest in the historical Christ. They were concerned with eschatological speculation. The Gospels were private works, originally of little importance ; no steps were taken to make Christian converts acquainted with what their Master said or did.

'No pictures,' he writes, 'of early Christianity have been conceived more fundamentally false, both to the spirit and the letter of historical fact, than those which represent S. Matthew or S. Peter as delivering catechetical lectures on the "Life of Christ."'

It was only when Docetism arose that recourse was had to the Gospels to refute the new heresy, and it was only when Marcion had constructed a New Testament Canon that the Church followed his example and made collections of the Gospels and Epistles.

Now this theory is one which we believe to be an untrue representation of the facts, whatever apparent probability it may seem to possess. Let us ask first what are Mr. Burkitt's arguments.



‘But the most convincing argument against postulating a literary source behind our Mark remains to be noticed. It is this—that the hypothesis of an “Ur-Marcus” presupposes an interest in the biographical details of the public life of Jesus Christ, of which there is little trace elsewhere. In the extant remains of very early Christian literature we find the doctrines of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection; we find the arguments from prophecy; we find the ethical teaching of the Sermon on the Mount; and as early as the middle of the second century we find copious references to the stories of the Nativity. In other words, we find what corresponds to the rudiments of the Creed, together with a real and vivid interest in Christian morality. But the details of the Galilean Ministry of Jesus Christ are hardly mentioned. It is not a mere chance that the fragments of non-canonical Gospels discovered in recent years—the Oxyrhynchus *Logia* (so-called) and the Gospel of Peter—concern themselves, the one with detached sayings of Jesus, the other with the Passion.’

And again, in speaking of the *Didache* :

‘But biographical interest in Christ is completely absent, even more completely absent than it is from the letters of S. Paul; for aught that appears in the *Didache*, Jesus of Nazareth might never have been crucified.’

We will deal first with the two arguments drawn from the second century. It is very remarkable that just at the same time when Professor Burkitt was delivering these lectures Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt announced the discovery of a new Gospel fragment, probably apocryphal, and probably of the second century, which completely silences his argument. Here is the account that they give in the Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund :

‘The scene is at Jerusalem by the Temple; and the fragment begins with the conclusion of a speech of our Lord to His disciples, exhorting them to avoid the example of the Pharisees, and in solemn words warning them of the penalties which await the evil doer both in this world and in the next. Jesus then takes His disciples with Him inside the Temple to the place of purification, where His presence is challenged by a Pharisee, who reproaches Him for entering the sanctuary without having performed the requisite religious ceremonies of purification.

A short dialogue ensues, in which Jesus asks the Pharisee if he is pure, and the Jew answers, recounting the different religious rites for cleansing purposes, which he has observed. To this our Lord delivers an eloquent and crushing reply, contrasting outward with inward purity. In stern accents He recalls the foulness of the pools below the Temple hill, and draws a striking contrast between the outward bathing prescribed by Jewish ritual and the inward cleansing which He and His disciples have received in the waters of eternal life.'

Nor is the argument from the *Didache* of any greater value. The *Didache* is, as Mr. Burkitt reminds us, a manual of creed, practice and duty, and it is just as sound to argue from the absence of reference to the Gospel narrative in the *Didache* that the Church of the first or second century took no interest in the historical Christ as it would be to make the same deduction concerning the English Church from the Church Catechism. As a matter of fact, the *Didache* quite clearly presupposes the existence of a Gospel, to which it definitely refers. 'Neither pray as the hypocrites,' it says, 'but as the Lord commanded in *His Gospel*, thus pray ye.' And then follows the Lord's Prayer. 'And reprove another not in anger but in peace, as ye find in *the Gospel*. . . . And your praise and your almsgiving, so do ye as ye find it in *the Gospel of our Lord*.' <sup>1</sup> The reason, in fact, why the *Didache* does not give historical information about our Lord is that it was meant, not as a substitute for existing Gospels but as something additional to them. That is, too, the point of view from which we must look at the early Christian literature as a whole. It does not repeat the Gospel narrative, because it presupposes it. We have quite clear indication of the value attached to the words of our Lord by St. Paul.<sup>2</sup> We know that the narrative of the Crucifixion must have been the very basis of all Church teaching. In addition to that, it is impossible to evade the deduction which must be made from the language of St. Luke in two places. In the preface to his

<sup>1</sup> *The Teaching of the Apostles*, 15.

<sup>2</sup> On this point see Leipoldt, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 105.

Gospel, in well-known words, he tells Theophilus that he is going to give him more accurate information in order that he might know with certainty concerning the things in which he was instructed. Whether or no it was given by the Apostles, clearly instruction in the life of Christ was, in the opinion of St. Luke, part of what every Christian had learnt. Exactly the same impression is given by the well-known passage in the speech of St. Peter in the Acts :

‘ The word which He sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all)—that saying ye yourselves know, which was published throughout all Judaea, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached ; even Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power : who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil ; for God was with him.’<sup>1</sup>

And then it goes on to refer to the Death and the Resurrection. Clearly this passage, whether it comes from St. Peter himself, or is only what St. Luke thought St. Peter might have said, is a decisive proof that the outline of the Gospel narrative was presupposed in the Christian teaching.

From the very beginning of Christianity, as at the present day, there have been, and always will be, two types of men. There are those who approach Christianity from the historical side, and those who approach it from the metaphysical side. To some ages the central point has been the Incarnation ; to others the picture of the historical Christ has been the more attractive. No doubt St. Paul represents the one type of mind, St. Luke the other. But St. Paul’s teaching presupposes narratives like those of St. Luke, and St. Luke’s narrative was the basis of the teaching of his own time, just as in the time of Ignatius a narrative such as that of St. Luke was the basis of the Christian creed. We do not, therefore, in the least believe in Mr. Burkitt’s one-sided conception of primitive Christianity.

It may be convenient to consider for a moment the

<sup>1</sup> Acts x. 36 *sq.*

parallel arguments which Mr. Burkitt uses about the collection of St. Paul's Epistles. According to him it was Marcion who first made a collection of St. Paul's Epistles :

' Marcion's edition of the Pauline Epistles very possibly represents an earlier stage of the collection of S. Paul's letters than the canonical. The history of the collection of these letters is distinct from the question of the genuineness of any or either of them. . . . It is indeed wholly uncertain how or when these letters were first brought together into a *Corpus*. I think we may fairly consider our present collection to be at least a second edition, revised and enlarged ; and there is something to be said for supposing that the previous edition was due to Marcion's reverence for the great Apostle.'

He continues : ' There is clear evidence that some of the letters, especially 1 Corinthians, were known and held in great respect by writers earlier than or contemporary with Marcion. But there is no tangible evidence for an *Apostolicon*, a collection of the Epistles.' As against Mr. Burkitt's conclusion we may quote the following from Dr. Leipoldt. He writes :

' From this statement of facts we must conclude that in the sub-Apostolic period a whole series of New Testament letters was universally esteemed and made use of. It included the Epistles of Paul, especially Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, the Catholic Epistles 1 Peter and 2 John, besides the Epistle to the Hebrews. Probably there were collections of letters from which the Christians drew their knowledge of these Epistles.' <sup>1</sup>

It has always seemed to us that the arguments in favour of the possession by Polycarp of a collection of St. Paul's Epistles are almost conclusive. Not only does he shew an extraordinary acquaintance with them in his Epistle, but also we find him engaged in making a collection of the letters of St. Ignatius. Is it in the least reasonable to believe that the Church would busy itself with making a collection of the letters of St. Ignatius before it possessed a collection of the letters of St. Paul ? We may go a step

<sup>1</sup> Leipoldt, *op. cit.* p. 190.



further. At the time of the Apostolic Fathers no doubt there were still reminiscences of the oral Gospel, but we know that St. Matthew's Gospel was known; we have all but conclusive evidence of the use of St. John's; we have in the *Didache* a clear reference to a written Gospel as an authority. We cannot say certainly whether or no there was a Canon of the Four Gospels, but we may, we think, conclude that there were already in the Churches authorized expositions of our Lord's life, which were regularly used. Moreover, it is well known that just at this time we begin to find books of the New Testament quoted as Scripture. It is the custom of writers like Mr. Burkitt to explain these passages away, but is that either necessary or reasonable? In New Testament times 'the Scriptures' were, of course, the Old Testament; but to St. Paul—as Dr. Leipoldt clearly writes—the words of our Lord were Scriptural authority. Only so long as the tradition was oral, it was the content and not the form which was appealed to. The Apostolic Fathers represent just the transition period, and quite naturally we find the first beginnings in the use of New Testament writings as Scripture. By the time of Justin the change is complete.<sup>1</sup>

We are now in a position to suggest an alternative theory for the growth of the Canon. From the earliest period of Christianity the interest in our Lord's Life, the narrative particularly of the Crucifixion, and the authority of our Lord's words, must have been supreme; but for the first generation of the Church would be dependent on an oral tradition. Written documents, if they existed, would only be subordinate in value to what was oral. How soon the narrative or the words of our Lord were read regularly in the Churches we do not know: the custom had become definite by the time of Justin. We do know that in the lifetime of St. Paul his letters were read in the Churches, and this makes it probable that, side by side with the prophetic discourse, oral or written narratives concerning our

<sup>1</sup> The evidence for the use of the New Testament by the Apostolic Fathers is put in a convenient form in the *Criticism of the New Testament* (St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902), pp. 183-207.

Lord's Life and words would soon be made use of. At any rate, it was on the Life and sayings of our Lord that all Christianity—Pauline or otherwise—was built up. At the end of the first century came the rise of Docetism, which, Mr. Burkitt thinks, called into existence the official use of the Gospels. We should rather hold that it was the possession of the Gospel which caused the condemnation of Docetism. Up till the beginning of the second century each Church would probably have a more or less independent tradition, corrected by the constant intercourse between Church and Church. When, owing to the religious tendencies of the times, there came, in the reign of Hadrian, a great outburst of Gnosticism, it was necessary for the Gnostics to have a written tradition to appeal to, and hence arose the mutilated or the Apocryphal Gospel and the expurgated editions of St. Paul's Epistles. It was the existence of this danger which changed the unofficial recognition by the separate Churches into the official recognition of a definite Canon. What Marcion and Marcion's contemporaries did was not to create a New Testament Canon, for that had been growing up for two generations, but to compel the Church more definitely to define the Canon and to limit its acceptance to works which could definitely, as it seemed, prove their Apostolic origin. Hence books like the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, and some of the Apocryphal Gospels which, owing to their edifying character, had been read in the Churches, came to be discarded, and the sacred books restricted to those which could properly authenticate their position.<sup>1</sup>

## II.

We pass now to the date at which the several Gospels were written. Mr. Burkitt sums up his conclusions as follows :

' I. 30-70 A.D. Oral Period. No written "Gospel" appears

<sup>1</sup> Harnack puts the acceptance of the Fourfold Gospel in Asia shortly after the year 110, but connects it with an ingenious theory about

during this period, nor any formal shaping of the Gospel history as a whole. S. Paul's accounts of the Lord's Supper and of the Resurrection do not appear to have any *literary* connexion with what we read in our Gospels. To the end of this first Period we may assign the fly-sheet underlying Mk. xiii. (in Greek) and St. Matthew's Collection of Messianic Prophecies (in Hebrew).

'2. 70-110 A.D. Period of the writing of the Gospels.

Gospel of Mark, 70-80 A.D.

Gospel of Luke (and Acts), 100 A.D.

Gospel of Matthew, 90-100 A.D., in any case before 110 A.D.

Gospel of John, 100-110 A.D.'

With these dates we may compare the conclusions that Dr. Harnack arrived at in his work on the Chronology of Early Christian Literature :

'Probably 65-70. The Gospel of St. Mark.

'Probably 70-75. The Gospel according to St. Matthew, apart from certain later additions.

'78-93. The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.

'Not after 110 and not before 80. John the Presbyter, the Gospel of John, and the three Epistles of John. Shortly afterwards the unguine end of St. Mark's Gospel and the completion of the Four Gospels in Asia.

It will be noticed at once that in every point the English writer places his dates later than the German Professor. Certainly Mr. Burkitt cannot be accused of erring on the side of tradition, and we would suggest certain reasons for thinking that, on the whole, the dates of Harnack are to be preferred.

To begin with the Gospel of St. Luke, concerning which we have the most definite information. Mr. Burkitt accepts the attribution of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles to Luke the physician, the companion of St. Paul. Harnack, in the work we have already referred to,<sup>1</sup> has gone over the ground once more with the very greatest care, and has come definitely to the conclusion that that opinion is justified. It is difficult, we think, for

the wickedness of the elders, which seems to us purely apocryphal (see *Chronologie des Altchristlichen Literatur*, pp. 681-700).

<sup>1</sup> *Lukas der Arzt*.

anyone who works on the lines laid down by Sir John Hawkins, and who masters Harnack's book, to arrive at any other conclusion. But Mr. Burkitt brings in a further point: he revives and adopts the theory that St. Luke was acquainted with Josephus. The argument is reproduced from Dr. Schmiedel's articles in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, and is given by Mr. Burkitt in his fourth chapter, and we would refer our readers to the statement of it there. No doubt it is an extremely ingenious piece of work, but it entirely fails to convince us that it is true. It is to us quite inconceivable that St. Luke could have had a sufficient acquaintance with Josephus' writings to pick out by careless reading two blunders, and to have shewn so little acquaintance with the work as a whole. The unsatisfactory character of the theorem is shewn by the very laboured attempt made to justify it in Krenkel's work on the subject,<sup>1</sup> in which three hundred and fifty pages are devoted to supporting the thesis, and the only conclusion the reader can arrive at is that the arguments are most inadequate. We agree with Harnack and with Schürer that St. Luke was not acquainted with the writings of Josephus. What the particular cause of his mistakes—if mistakes they be—was we cannot say. It is clear that he had some source, not Josephus, from which he obtained knowledge of the history of his time. If this argument be rejected there is no need for the late date to which Mr. Burkitt would assign the Gospel, nor has it any appearance of having been written in the writer's extreme old age. Any period after the year 70, probably not very long after, will much better suit the situation. It would be possible, in fact, to throw it back a year or two earlier, though this is unlikely; but 70–90 may give reasonable limits. This, again, will throw back St. Mark's Gospel to the year 64–70, which will correspond with the tradition which represents St. Mark to have written it shortly after the death of St. Peter; for it is quite certain that St. Luke made use of St. Mark's Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> *Josephus und Lucas. Der schriftstellerische Einfluss des Jüdischen Geschichtschreibers auf den Christlichen.* Nachgewiesen von Max Krenkel. (Leipzig, 1894.)



When we come to the other two Gospels we have less definite evidence to go upon. We cannot go over the ground here, but we are quite convinced that Ignatius was acquainted with both works, and this makes it extremely improbable that they were written later than the year 100.

So far as probability goes, the dates given by Dr. Harnack are more likely to be correct than those given by Mr. Burkitt. The latter is obviously always on his guard against what he imagines to be the English fault of dating Christian documents too early. We are exceedingly glad that he should accept nothing which he cannot establish conscientiously, but we are convinced that here, as elsewhere, the traditional—and, if you will, the English—dates will be established as criticism advances. The apologists, if apologists they were, who believed that Tatian and Justin knew our four Gospels or accepted the genuineness of Ignatius and Polycarp have been justified by criticism, and we are quite certain that eventually it will become clear that all our Gospels were written before the close of the first century, and that most, if not all, are the product of the second Christian generation, which lasted from 60–90 A.D.

### III.

The problem of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels is as fascinating as it is elusive. For nearly a century scholars have been working at it steadily, and on only a few points has any agreement been arrived at. On one point, however, all writers are now agreed. To quote Mr. Burkitt's words, 'we are bound to conclude that Mark contains the whole of a document which Matthew and Luke have independently used, and, further, that Mark contains very little else beside': in other words, that our St. Mark's Gospel was one of the main sources of the other two. As Mr. Burkitt says: 'This conclusion is extremely important; it is the one solid contribution made by the scholarship of the nineteenth century toward the solution of the Synoptic Problem.'

It may be well to pause for a moment here and remind ourselves how clearly this statement exposes the uncertainty of a great deal of criticism. The problem which we have before us is probably insoluble. If we had Tatian's *Diatessaron* before us we might possibly have extracted the Fourth Gospel, but we could never have reconstructed, as a whole, the Synoptic Gospels. If we had had St. Matthew and St. Luke before us, and not St. Mark, it is, we think, quite clear that we could never have arrived at the contents of the second Gospel. But in these circumstances it is not surprising if any further certainty in reconstructing the source of the Gospel narrative is impossible.

Not only is the priority of St. Mark universally recognized, but the historical value of his narrative is becoming more and more clear. Mr. Burkitt emphasizes this very strongly. He shews, by a careful examination of two points—the crisis in our Lord's ministry which led to His separation from orthodox Judaism, and the relations of the narrative in St. Mark to the general history of the time—that it gives an adequate and plausible account of events. We are not certain that Mr. Burkitt's arguments are not more acute than really solid. They are, like some of Sir William Ramsay's reconstructions of the history of the Acts of the Apostles, exceedingly acute, very attractive, but yet unsubstantial. Mr. Burkitt might, we believe, have been able to make out very nearly as good a case for the Gospel of St. John as he does for that of St. Mark, if he had begun with it. At any rate, we do not think that his final conclusion is substantiated—that not only is St. Mark historical, but that it is the only good history that we have :

‘ If the narrative of Mark has a historical background, and in its main outlines and arrangement fits without violence into the framework of secular circumstances and events, we are not at liberty seriously to disturb the proportions of this narrative and to change its general character, in order to interpolate into it stories derived from a wholly different view of the Ministry.’

We do not think that this inference is quite justified.

St. Mark's Gospel may give us quite an adequate account of events, but not necessarily a complete one. As we shall see, the greater part of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels is probably derived from quite as early a source ; nor are we yet convinced that the historical information given by St. John is worthless.

But as to the positive statement of the value of St. Mark we have no doubt that Mr. Burkitt's conclusion is correct. This conclusion is also shared by Dr. Salmon :

' I need not defer stating the opinion, to which my whole study of the Synoptic Gospels has led me, of the superior value of St. Mark's Gospel. . . . It is St. Mark's Gospel that must be consulted by any one who desires to know whether there was anything gradual in the process by which the attachment of His followers was gained, and the opposition of His adversaries excited.'

It is well known that tradition tells us that St. Mark was the interpreter of St. Peter, and that the Gospel which goes by his name contains the story of our Lord's Life as it was given by St. Peter. Dr. Salmon gives an ingenious and, we think, not unsatisfactory corroboration of this statement. He points out that while the preface of St. Mark contains in the first thirteen verses all the character of being an abridgment of another source, it is with the entrance of St. Peter into the narrative that the Gospel assumes its special character :

' What inclines me most to accept the statement of Papias, is the marked difference of style between the section of the Gospel which relates what happened before the calling of Peter and those which tell of what happened after it—the contrast between the meagreness of St. Mark's narrative in the one case, and its fullness in the other. In the earlier history, as told by St. Matthew and by St. Luke, we find a common element which could not have been derived from Mark, who tells the same story with so much greater brevity, that the first question we are disposed to submit to critical investigation is whether St. Mark's is more than an abridgment of an earlier narrative. But when we go on to compare the remainder of St. Mark's first chapter with the corresponding passage of Matthew, we

find the parts quite reversed: it is now St. Matthew who is the abridger, St. Mark who tells the full story.'

There is, then, one solid result of criticism so far. St. Mark's Gospel is, in its main portion, prior to St. Matthew and St. Luke, and contains an account of our Lord's ministry which has all the appearance, on critical grounds, of being historical.

But now we have the more difficult question to face of the origin of those portions of St. Matthew and St. Luke which are not contained in St. Mark. Where did they come from? What was the character of the documents from which they were derived? Here we have before us two quite separate theories. Dr. Harnack has reconstructed for us what he believes to have been the original document as a collection of the Sayings of our Lord. This theory arose first from two causes: the undoubted fact that this common source must have contained a larger proportion of discourse than St. Mark, and the misinterpretation of a statement of Papias. As this misinterpretation has become common property, it may be as well to quote what Dr. Salmon says on the subject:

'Before I part with this statement of Papias that Matthew wrote τὰ λόγια in Hebrew, it is proper to mention an inference which Schleiermacher drew from it, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which has been fortunate enough to find more acceptance than in my opinion is deserved. He understood by τὰ λόγια a collection of our Lord's sayings, and imagined that such was the nature of the earliest Gospel. Of late years this idea has been very widely adopted. When, not long since, an Egyptian papyrus was discovered, in which many supposed utterances of our Lord were recorded, with the introduction *Jesus saith*, the leaves were generally described as taken from a collection of *Logia*, and any saying of our Lord is commonly spoken of as a *Logion*. But for this use of the word I find no authority earlier than the nineteenth century; and now it rests solely on a doubtful interpretation of an ambiguous word in an isolated extract from a lost book.'

In opposition to this theory both Mr. Burkitt and Dr. Salmon agree that the common source of St. Matthew



and St. Luke, which for convenience they call 'Q,' was a Gospel containing an account of the Crucifixion. This Gospel, according to Dr. Salmon, was the original St. Matthew, and it was used not only by the author of our St. Matthew and St. Luke but by St. Mark as well. We will quote the passage in which he gives his theory as to the composition and date of the Gospels :

'Applying now these general remarks to the criticism of the First Gospel, no reader of that Gospel can help feeling that we have in it a most precious and most authentic record of our Lord's teaching; and if we had no other Gospel, we should scarcely have ventured on a task so precarious as to attempt to discriminate between the antiquity of its various parts. But we have two other Gospels showing in many places such close affinity with St. Matthew's that we cannot help concluding that either these two made use of St. Matthew's Gospel, or else that all three drew from a common source. The latter was the conclusion to which I found myself forced to give the preference. I provisionally called that source "Q," not wishing to anticipate any conclusions to which more detailed study might lead me. Still, as there seemed to be indications that the source was Aramaic, I find it increasingly difficult to resist the conclusion that what I have called "Q" is no other than the Aramaic Matthew, to which tradition points as the earliest of the Gospel narratives.'

'These results of criticism substantially agree with all that historical testimony enables us to assert; and if they be accepted as correct, we may place the Gospel records in chronological order, as follows: First must have come the lost Aramaic by St. Matthew, which is the basis of all three Synoptics; next would come Mark, whose Greek appears to have been used both by "Matthew" and St. Luke. As between the last two, the Greek Matthew seems to show more signs of posteriority; but, until I am shown more satisfactory proof of acquaintance by either with the work of the other, I must hold that the interval between their dates of composition was not so long as to allow time for the earlier of the two to pass from being the local form in which in a particular district the history of our Saviour's life was told, to become the property of the whole Church, and thus arrive at such general circulation as necessarily to become known at a distance from its place of composition.'

'It does not come within the scope of this essay to treat of the Fourth Gospel; but its Evangelist was clearly acquainted with St. Luke's Gospel; and I find no reason for being less confident about his knowledge of St. Mark's. He could hardly have been ignorant of the Aramaic Matthew, since he shows acquaintance with that language; but as to his use of the Greek Matthew, I have not yet been able to come to a positive conclusion. I find no chronological difficulty in believing that he might have known it; for both the Greek Matthew and St. John's Gospel appear to me to have been products of the same age, which may be described either as late in the Apostolic age, or early in the sub-Apostolic. I suspend my judgment on the question whether some points of coincidence between these two documents, if more than casual, are best explained by assuming the Greek editor's acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel, or *vice versa*.'

There is one third point which Mr. Burkitt and Dr. Salmon both seem to pass over. It is well known that there is a considerable section of St. Luke's Gospel, containing some of the most attractive sections in the Gospel narrative, which is peculiar to that Gospel. Is this derived from a third source or not? Our own opinion, following Dr. Sanday, is that it was: that St. Luke had at least one other document, besides those we have mentioned, before him, and that where this conflicted with his other sources he generally preferred it. The section in question has certain characteristics of its own which distinguish it from the rest of the Gospel, and this theory seems also to correspond with St. Luke's own statement in his preface. When he tells us that *many* have already undertaken to write an account of our Lord, we cannot really limit the number of histories with which he was acquainted to two. He must surely have had at least three before him, and it is possible that he may have had others.

But all these later conclusions are quite provisional. We started with one conclusion which seemed to us established; the difference of opinion which we have noted between typical investigators at the present time shews us that on no further point is there agreement. But though there is no agreement as to the form and character of the

sources of St. Matthew and St. Luke, there is agreement, both as to the value of these sources and as to the manner in which, within certain limits, the writers have used them. That St. Luke is the more historical of the two is clear : that St. Matthew arranges his material rather from the point of view of subjects than to give a continuous narrative is obvious : that both alike somewhat tone down the roughnesses and natural expressions of St. Mark is also clear : that somewhat more than the latter St. Matthew and St. Luke are influenced by the thoughts and needs of the second or third generation of Christians is natural. None of these admissions go beyond the characteristics of any historical document. Having made them, we are left with the result that the sources of St. Matthew and St. Luke, equally with St. Mark, contain an early and correct exposition of the acts and sayings of our Lord. Dr. Salmon is quite clear on this point :

‘The more I study the Gospels the more convinced I am that we have in them contemporaneous history ; that is to say, that we have in them the stories told of Jesus immediately after His death, and which had been circulated, and, as I am disposed to believe, put in writing while He was yet alive.’

It may be remarked that this quotation comes from his discussion of that very difficult question, the story of the Gadarene swine.

And again :

‘I cannot doubt that these writings present us with the story as told in the very first assemblies of Christians, by men who had been personal disciples of Jesus ; nor do I think that the account of any of our Lord’s miracles would have been very different if we could have the report of it as published in a Jerusalem newspaper next morning. Of all attempts to eliminate miracle from the Gospel history the expectation to do so by historical criticism of our sources is the vainest ; for it proceeds on the assumption that the first reporters were less likely than we should be now to ascribe a supernatural origin to what they had witnessed.’

Neither Mr. Burkitt nor Dr. Harnack speak quite so

definitely, but Dr. Harnack is clear that his source of St. Matthew, as he has reconstructed it, contains an historical account of our Lord's words, and a careful study of Mr. Burkitt's investigations gives us the same result.

But when we pass to St. John's Gospel the result put before us is not so reassuring. Mr. Burkitt concludes that in the Fourth Gospel 'neither the narrative nor the discussions are to be regarded as history, as matters of the past fact.' The two particular features that he examines, and on which he bases his conclusions, are the story of the raising of Lazarus, and the omission of the account of the Last Supper. With regard to the latter we may at once pass it over. It is quite certain that St. John knew of the other Gospels, and unless he had a particular reason for doing so it was not in the least necessary for him to repeat what was well known in the Church. Why he did not do so, why he attached the Eucharistic discussion rather to the feeding of the five thousand, we do not know, but there is no reflection therein upon his truthfulness as an historian. With regard to the raising of Lazarus we certainly think that Mr. Burkitt overstates the case. We have already referred to what seems to us his exaggerated claim for St. Mark, but we find the difficulties which he raises to a certain extent shared by Dr. Salmon, who writes as follows :

'Regarding, as I do, our written Gospels as but records of the narratives delivered *viva voce* by the first witnesses, I feel no distress at ordinary omissions, or discrepancies, which are sufficiently accounted for by the necessarily fragmentary character of the records of the narratives which have been preserved. Yet I do feel that the absence from the Synoptics of any mention of the raising of Lazarus is a great stumbling-block. This is an event which, according to St. John's account, made a great sensation, and which we should imagine nobody who knew of it would omit.'

We must own that we are still unconvinced, but we have not space within the limits of the present article to examine into the historical credibility of St. John. It is only our duty to report that the conclusions of Dr. Salmon and



Mr. Burkitt are unfavourable to his claims to historical narration. We are quite certain, as we have said, that Mr. Burkitt overstates the case. The judgement of Dr. Salmon appears to us more sober :

‘The Fourth Evangelist seems to me to have known the localities, and to have had some trustworthy sources of information. Yet all agree that his account is later than that of the Synoptics, and I have not always confidence in accepting additions which he makes to the previously published story. The best theory I can make about him is that he was the Apostle John’s “hermeneutes” and assistant, with whom that Apostle could not dispense even if he knew Greek, as he probably did. For an Eastern might be able to understand Greek, and even to speak it well enough for commercial purposes, and yet not feel himself competent to address an audience in that language.’

In a letter written recently to the *Guardian* Mr. Burkitt refers in a somewhat depreciatory way to the ‘older apologetic.’ We are glad for one reason that Mr. Burkitt should have felt dissatisfied with it ; it has led him to re-examine questions connected with the Gospel in a new and fresh way, and to substantiate their general historical truth by independent and often strong arguments. But we are not quite certain that eventually it will not be found that this old-fashioned apologetic with relation particularly to St. John’s Gospel has a good deal more to be said for it than Mr. Burkitt thinks. After all, it is the apologetic or, as we should prefer to put it, the historical criticism of Lightfoot, and Westcott, and Hort, all men of the greatest learning, candour, and critical power—men who have been Mr. Burkitt’s own teachers. It is admitted that the Fourth Gospel contains a translation of our Lord’s words into the language and ideas of a later time. It may be admitted that the writer did not for the most part arrange his subject-matter in accordance with careful historical order : that if he be St. John himself his memory may have become dimmed : that in any case the theological interest was with him supreme ; but we cannot forget the long line of critics, including Rénan, who have found

valuable historical information in the book. Our own investigations have found many passages which seem to illuminate the Synoptic narrative, and we do not doubt that ultimately Mr. Burkitt's criticism of the writer of the Fourth Gospel will be found to be inadequate.

#### IV.

There remains one final question which we must ask. What are the bearings of these criticisms and discussions on the faith of a Christian? It is no doubt a question which some of our readers have asked, and which is, at the present time, giving perplexity to some minds. We have put before our readers quite frankly the critical views of Mr. Burkitt and Dr. Salmon; we have given reasons for dissenting from them in some points, and they would be the last to claim infallibility for themselves; but the fact remains that such views are held by men who are sober critics and good Christians: that they conflict violently with the traditional beliefs of many of our readers, and may make some people ask, If our old views are overthrown in this way, what are we to believe as to the nature of Christ? Some few years ago very similar difficulties were raised concerning the Old Testament by many people; now those difficulties have largely passed away. Those who felt them have been compelled, to a certain extent, to readjust their old opinions; they have re-examined the way in which the Old Testament witnesses to revealed religion and to Christianity, and they have come to the conclusion that no criticism could by any possibility prove anything which would conflict with their belief. The existence of the Old Testament books many centuries before the beginning of Christianity is a certainty, and their witness to monotheism, to One God exalted in righteousness, to the mission of the chosen people, to the expectation of the Messiah, remains the same, whatever theory we may have as to the names of the authors of the different books, the literary character of their composition, or the development of Jewish history.

Are we yet able to say the same thing about the New Testament? All the writers we have quoted suggest that their investigations, at any rate, are independent of doctrinal difficulties.

Dr. Salmon writes :

‘ I did feel that I possessed this impartiality in investigating the authorship of New Testament books; because I believed that the credit of our religion was not pledged to any theory on this subject. It was no fundamental article of our faith that St. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, or that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Our belief in the truth of the facts recorded in the Gospels would not be affected by any uncertainty or error as to the traditional names of the compilers; because it was not on the credit of their names that our assent was given.’

So, too, Mr. Burkitt :

‘ I have purposely abstained in these Lectures from discussing most of those parts or features of the Gospel history which usually form the subject-matter of modern controversies. Our belief or disbelief in most of the Articles in the Apostles’ Creed does not ultimately rest on historical criticism of the Gospels, but upon the general view of the universe, of the order of things, which our training and environment, or our inner experience, has led us severally to take.’

Dr. Abbott, at the beginning of his preface, writes even more strongly :

‘ Many years have elapsed since the author was constrained (not by *a priori* considerations but by historical and critical evidence) to disbelieve in the miraculous element of the Bible. Yet he retained the belief of his childhood and youth—rooted more firmly than before—in the eternal unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in the supernatural but non-miraculous incarnation of the Son as Jesus Christ, and in Christ’s supernatural but non-miraculous resurrection after He had offered Himself up as a sacrifice for the sins of the world.

‘ The belief is commonly supposed to be rendered impossible by the disbelief. This book is written to shew that there is no such impossibility.

‘ The vast majority of the worshippers of Christ base their

worship to a very large extent—as the author did in his early youth under the cloud of Paley's *Evidences*—on their acceptance of His miracles as historical facts. In the author's opinion this basis is already demonstrably unsafe, and may be at any moment, by some new demonstration, absolutely destroyed.'

And, again :

'It is, however, to a third class of readers that the author mainly addresses himself. Having in view the experiences of his own early manhood, he regards with a strong fellow feeling those who desire to worship Christ and to be loyal and faithful to Him, if only they can at the same time be loyal and faithful to truth, and who doubt the compatibility of the double allegiance.

'These, many of them, cannot even conceive how they can worship Christ at the right hand of God, or the Son in the bosom of the Father in heaven, unless they first believe in Him as miraculously manifested on earth. Not being able to accept Him as miraculous, they reject Him as a Saviour. To them this book specially appeals, endeavouring to shew, in a general and popular way—on psychological, historical, and critical grounds—how the rejection of the claim made by most Christians that their Lord is miraculous, may be compatible with a frank and full acceptance of the conclusion that He is, in the highest sense, divine.'

Is the position which these writers put before us a consistent one? Let us ask ourselves for a moment on what broad line of argument we can base our belief in the Divine character of Christ. We accept it on account of the continuous relation of the Old Testament to the New, and the fulfilment of the Old in the New. We accept it for the marvellous transformation in life and thought which the earliest Christian writings present to us. We accept it for the continuous miracle of the growth and spread and history of Christianity, for the transformed views of morality and religion that it introduced, for its constant and unceasing vitality, its continuous victory and advance, for the fact of Christianity and the existence of the Christian Church at the present day. We accept it, again, because of our own religious feelings and religious



experiences. What historical basis is necessary, then, to supplement these? Quite clearly all these arguments are valid, though our ideas as to the authorship and date and even the historical credibility of many books of the New Testament were changed. But one thing, we venture to think, is necessary, and that is the picture of the Personality of Christ, as presented to us in the Gospels, and living in the thoughts of early Christianity. If that should be shewn to be baseless and untrue, we venture to think that there would be very considerable reason for despair. But so far from that being the case, all criticism tends to reassure us on the point. This is brought out very well for us by the author of *The Fifth Gospel*. He writes :

‘The Gospel which Paul gave to the world can only be explained, as it is seen to be based, on historical data connected with the life and work of Jesus Christ. In the light of nineteen centuries of Christian thought and feeling, largely the result of the work which Paul accomplished in the early years of the Christian era, the greatness of Paul is unquestionable, but when we examine the Gospel which he preached, and which made him what he was, we are at every step led up to a greater personality still—the Christ of Paul’s experience, the Jesus of Nazareth who was dead, but whom Paul affirmed to be alive. To account for Christianity apart from the Gospel of Paul is impossible, and to account for Paul himself apart from the historic Jesus is equally impossible.’

And, again, the same writer brings out the various different threads of tradition which help us in arriving at the Personality of Christ.

‘The supreme importance which is attached to the Synoptic Gospels, as the only historical data upon which we can form a correct representation of the life and work of Jesus, is an instance of this limited view of history, which is fatal to a true interpretation of the personality of the Founder of Christianity. Without committing oneself to the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel as we now possess it, it is quite possible and reasonable to regard it as expressing the thought of John, as he looked back on what he had himself seen of that life which had been manifested, the Life which was with the Father, and

had been revealed in word and deed by the Master. It gives us a view of the personality of Jesus, not to be found in the Synoptists, but which is essential to any true explanation of the influence of Jesus, and without which the rise of Christianity is unintelligible. Similarly, there is the Gospel of Paul, the Gospel of the exalted Christ it is true, but not on that account to be regarded as destitute of historical value, for unless the story of the resurrection contained in the Synoptists is rejected simply because of its supernatural character, the relation between Paul and Jesus is as much a part of history and as essential to a true understanding of the rise of Christianity, as the other records.'

And while we have shewn that about much of the Gospel records there is sometimes difficulty and criticism, yet all our authorities combine in telling us that the general picture of the Christ given in the Synoptic Gospels is a true one. A hundred years ago there were no critical canons which enabled us to prove the authenticity of such records as the Gospels. The natural result was the extreme scepticism of the older critics. Over a century of criticism has made that impossible. A large number, if not all, of the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel narrative may now be looked upon, and may be accepted, as certain. Beyond doubt our position is very much stronger at the present day than it ever has been.

And what is the attitude of the devout Christian with regard to miracles? We cannot adopt the attitude of Paley, who could logically prove a miracle and logically deduce from a miracle the truth of Christianity. We know that the testimonies of human experience are too subtle for such methods. But we recognize, as Dr. Salmon reminds us, that the arguments against the miracles are not critical; we recognize that if we accept the truth of the Incarnation a miracle ceases to be a difficulty. To build up a logical argument able to create faith apart from religious experience is impossible; but if our faith is built up on a wide survey of facts and experience, if we are attracted by the teaching of Christ, the beauty of the Personality of Jesus of Nazareth, if we learn to accept Him as the Son of God, then the miraculous events of His

Life, from the Virgin Birth to the parting from His disciples—that Life of beneficent activity in which powers transcending those of man were never used for personal aggrandisement—take their fitting place in our scheme of history. We cannot base our belief on the formal arguments from miracles, but the record of Christ's Life in its completeness, arrived at by wise historical criticism, is a consistent and corroborative conclusion to our argument.

---

#### ART. IX.—THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS IN FRANCE : SOME PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS.

*Loi du 9 Décembre 1905 concernant la Séparation des Églises et de l'État.*

THE development of the ecclesiastical crisis in France has been a fruitful topic of discussion and the subject of much speculation in England during the past two years. As was perhaps inevitable, the views enunciated with regard to it alike in public and in private have been coloured to a large extent by the political and religious predilections of those who have set themselves to pronounce judgement upon the issues involved, whether in the light of a more or less competent knowledge of the facts or with the aid of a not always chastened imagination. Thus in some quarters we find it regarded as the determined struggle of a free people to liberate themselves, not from the influence of their national Church but from the iron yoke of papal autocracy ; to others the struggle presents itself as a revolt against sacerdotal control of any kind ; while to yet others the measures adopted by the French Government represent the fruits of a policy of calculated hostility, not merely to the Catholic Church but to Religion itself. Add to this a scarcely less inevitable tendency to institute comparisons between the situation in France, thus variously regarded, and the problems actual or hypothetical with which the minds of Englishmen are more intimately concerned in

their own country, and the possibility of arriving at a true conception of the case is still further diminished.

It is admittedly difficult to be impartial in regard to a matter in which one's sympathies are deeply engaged on one side or the other, but some service at least may be done by calling attention to aspects of the situation which have scarcely received adequate recognition in England and by an examination of certain judgements which are based upon premisses only partially true or even in some cases demonstrably incorrect. As an example of our meaning we may take Canon Hensley Henson's letter to the *Times* at the beginning of the current year.<sup>1</sup> It is seldom our fortune to agree with Canon Henson's views in matters ecclesiastical, but no one can deny the intrepidity and vigour with which he is accustomed to deal with the questions, and they are many, which happen from time to time to engage his attention.

We propose, then, to examine first the conclusions which have led Canon Henson to condemn the Church in France. He tells us that

'without passing any judgment whatever on the political action of a neighbouring and happily friendly nation, I may say, without fear of contradiction, that the French Church has so far failed in fulfilling the grand object for which Christian Society exists, that the majority of Frenchmen have ceased to desire Christianity as the basis of national morality. The Churchman and Christian have been identical terms; and since the Church has become intolerable, it is assumed that Christianity is politically impossible.'

He goes on to state that in France

'a movement for establishing complete public control over elementary education necessarily takes an anti-Christian character.' Again: 'Education is secular in France because the majority of French citizens have been led by their experience of denominational monopoly to a disgust of Christianity itself.'

It will be observed that the writer makes four sweeping statements: (1) 'The French Church has so far failed,' as is

<sup>1</sup> 'France and England: a Parallel and a Contrast' (*The Times*, January 1907).



proved by (2) that 'the majority of Frenchmen have ceased to desire Christianity as the basis of national morality'; which proves (3) that since Churchman and Christian 'have been identical terms,' and 'since the Church has become intolerable, it is assumed that Christianity is politically impossible.' From the third statement it follows that

'A movement for establishing complete public control over elementary education necessarily takes an anti-Christian character,' and 'education is secular in France because the majority of French citizens have been led by their experience of denominational monopoly to a disgust of Christianity itself.'

It is at least probable that 'the majority of Frenchmen,' 'the majority of French citizens,' are unknown to Canon Hensley Henson, and that his judgement is founded either on hearsay, or on the inferences which he has drawn from the General Elections; from the return to power of the successive ministries who in their anti-Christian policy, ever in *crescendo* since 1880, have suppressed religious education in the public elementary schools; expelled the Congregations (religious orders); promoted the extinction of the majority of the schools of the Christian Brothers (Frères Chrétiens, laymen) although one of the still authorized Orders; and step by step, as convenience and occasion serve, close schools taught by others even of the very few Orders still authorized; and lastly, have broken the Concordat in a manner, as it seems to us, hardly creditable to a civilized nation. While thus freeing the State of the obligations on its side entailed by the Concordat between Napoleon I. and Pius VII., the Government imposes *nolens volens* on the thus impoverished and crippled Church as the sole condition of keeping that part of the endowments, more specially individual in its origin and purpose, as well as belonging to the Vestries, a Constitution and Associations Cultuelles framed by the State (as represented by the anti-Catholic ministry), whether suited or no to the Constitution of the Roman Catholic Church.

Canon Henson professes to pass no judgement whatever on this anti-Catholic programme, which he classifies, not without reason, as 'political'; but he condemns indirectly, unconsciously perhaps, by his assertion that the majority of the French citizens have ceased to desire Christianity as the basis of national morality.

Let us now examine the supposed inference from the General Elections; after which the personal experiences and impressions of the writer of this article will be given for what they are worth, as against, or as confirming, the possible information derived from persons unknown, or from books, newspapers, magazine articles, or reviews, by which Canon Henson may have been influenced in forming his judgements. First, it should be remembered that the misleading possibilities of inferences are peculiarly great as regards nations and classes, and notably as regards France and England. To interpret truly French elections by English electoral experiences is impossible. The self-evident fact is that the majority in every contested cause, and in every country, means obviously that the victorious party is that which has found the majority of supporters; that even if the proportion of those who take the trouble to vote leaves unrepresented a great proportion of opinions, yet it is clear that these hardly merit the designation of 'opinions,' since those who hold them have been too indifferent to vote. Despite this, it should be stated that French voters have not seldom explained to the present writer that they wished this or disapproved that, but fearing to compromise themselves decided not to vote at all rather than to risk some loss or disadvantage for themselves, or to some relation, by voting against the Government. But practically such a frame of character may be classified as indifferent where opposition is concerned. Beyond, however, the above elementary similarity in all elections, it will best be shewn how General Elections differ in France and England by sketching such characteristics as strike a transplanted Briton living wholly among the French of all classes in town

and country, and of all opinions,<sup>1</sup> and by suggesting the determining prepossessions in French General Elections.

First and foremost, to the mass of French voters who actually vote every consideration is secondary to the permanence of the Republic and the avoidance of war. Perhaps it should be insisted on that, to be fair, so far the mass of the people have not realized *and do not believe* that religion is or can be seriously menaced. Its organization, its administration even, may be hindered, and much that is openly recognized as unjust may be done against the Church ; but the people, so far, refuse to believe that essentials are menaced : essentials to them being an open church, baptisms, first communions, marriage, extreme unction and burial by the Church. They recognize that a most effective organization, Freemasonry, is alike the enemy of the Church and the *Servante-Maitresse* of the Government ; but nevertheless the people believe that the Government will never allow such or such extreme measures ; and as measures which, effectively resisted, would have been realized as extreme, have not been so resisted, the people *en masse* have accepted, and are becoming used to, revolutionary changes without being aware of their magnitude and importance. Individuals have realized, but not the mass of the people. Thus the expulsion of the Religious Orders was carried out piece by piece, having been ingeniously introduced under the pretext of reasonable State recognition, and even protection, should the State not be forced conscientiously in special cases to withhold authorization. The instructions from Rome were submission ; consequently little or no resistance was offered. The sequel is now history. The Authorized Orders, with a very few exceptions, fared quite as badly as the so-called unauthorized, and in this, apart from the want of good faith, the Government was consistent, as there was no sort of difference as to moral value and devotedness of life. Again, Church school after Church school has been quietly closed in

<sup>1</sup> In relation to members of the present Ministry, however, this does not extend beyond their speeches and acts—their published speeches and acts.

obedience to the State. The genuinely popular manifestations against the Inventory-making of Church furniture, treasures, funds (including money received in collections, by seats, &c.) far from being initiated and encouraged by Rome, or by French ecclesiastics, was discouraged. Again, the Pope enjoined that no *émeute* or disturbance of any kind should accompany the inauguration of the post-separation *régime*. All passed, and passes quietly. The few disturbances being local and not general, the patience and self-control of Catholics is construed by the Government as indifference or even approval, and by the mass of the people, who neither see nor hear any effective protest, as a proof that, so far, no serious harm has been done to the Church or to religion, and that all will go on as before.

During the last General Election (May 1906) France was bespread with posters declaring that no Confiscation was involved in the Separation,<sup>1</sup> and the present writer was often assured by working men and tradespeople voters in town and country, that even had there been any such danger, the Government quite understood by the 'affaire des Inventaires' that the people would not tolerate interference with parochial Church property, the property of the fabrics included. Despite this, the impression of the transplanted Briton is that had the last General Election taken place in March 1907, after the final spoliation, the majority for the present Government would hardly have been less, since the parish churches remain open, and the functions continue as before: the suffering is the monopoly of the clergy and the very poor and helpless, and the necessities caused by the spoliation are relieved by that minority who care supremely for the things of God. *A propos* of the Inventories, it is worth recording here that the idea that the manifestations in opposition to these proceedings were the work of smart rowdies, the tools of Royalists, is an error, and an account in an English weekly newspaper of young aristocrats with orchids in their buttonholes tickled the fancy of those

<sup>1</sup> The *affiches*, or posters, were those of the Government candidates and included this assurance in their programme.



on the spot, who, though unable to swear that no Englishman or American lounged by or even joined in a row, can state that no Frenchmen (in the plural) so decorated resisted the inventory-making. It is rare to see a Frenchman with a flower in his buttonhole—and certainly such an occasion would not have been chosen. Probably the correspondent knew that some few years ago a Royalist (no one of any special distinction), started a white buttonhole league—but it has passed into the forgotten. But, be that as it may, we can testify to the genuineness of the manifestations, and (as at the departure of Cardinal Richard from the Archbishop's house in Paris) to the immense disproportion between the men and women, between those of the artisan and middle classes and those of the upper classes, in the crowds; the men far outnumbered the women, and the working folk their richer brethren, though all classes were represented. As for the Inventories, parish after parish in Paris and its outskirts, districts rivalling Southwark and Plaistow in squalor; districts such as those of Bethnal Green and Stepney, St. Pancras and North London, London Docks, Vauxhall, Poplar, Clerkenwell and Notting Hill; all expressed themselves energetically against the Inventory-making. The very poor, the artisans, domestic servants, shop people, clerks, came out in tough resistance; and many a curé and vicaire received their blows in sheltering the unlucky and innocent police. 'Cela ne vous regarde pas; laissez faire,' shouted a carpenter in fury at the interference of the curé in one case within our knowledge.

In a very poor district church built chiefly by the curé, but largely helped by the people, these were only kept inside the church and quiet by the curé's promise to prevent the police from entering; the working men had given up their day's work to be there, and as the curé and police exchanged *pourparlers*, shouted 'C'est de nos deniers—de nos deniers.' The curé of course was summoned and fined, but peace had been kept. The Leadenhall and Smithfield world in Paris is very independent as to the tyranny of the Bourse de Travail and also as to Church

matters. The butchers shewed themselves so ready that a curé, fearing too professional blows, agreed to accept a body guard of fifty, on condition that they pledged themselves to obedience, and to remain inside the church, where they spent the night awaiting the expected surprise visit of the Government agents. A church near the Gare du Nord was garrisoned by tradespeople and business people, shop assistants, commercial travellers and clerks ; and even in the aristocratic quarters all classes were concerned. To the same prison room were consigned a young nobleman, a packer from a warehouse, and a student in a public hospital. The packer died from blood-poisoning, the result of his imprisonment when wounded in the row ; he wrote to the young nobleman, asking his ' cher camarade ' to come and see him. All over the country in varying degrees the manifestations shewed these same characteristics. A Parisian, in trade, explained the movement to the transplanted Briton thus :

' C'est évident d'un côté, l'expulsion des Sœurs et des religieux est une chose plus grave, et on n'a rien dit ; mais, de l'autre, faire les inventaires c'est mettre la main sur les biens d'autrui, sur *nos* biens. Est-ce qu'on fait un inventaire des biens d'autrui ? Du vin du voisin ? De son linge ? Jamais de la vie ! Faire les inventaires c'était se déclarer propriétaire, ce que l'État n'avait nul droit de faire. Moi, je ne pratique pas, mais il faut respecter les idées de tout le monde, pas seulement des juifs et des franc-maçons. On nous a bien dit qu'on faisait la Séparation pour donner plus de liberté au Culte ; que les choses du Culte et de la politique doivent être séparées. Bien ; quelle est la première chose qu'on voit après que la loi est votée ? *Accaparer les choses des églises* ; faire les inventaires de nos biens ; après, quoi ? On attaquera nos poches ! Mon Dieu ! est-ce qu'après un divorce l'homme s'occupe de sa femme ? se mêle de ses affaires ? *Jamais !* chaqu'un va de son côté. Nous nous sommes montrés contre les Inventaires ; nous ne voulions pas cela : socialisme, pur socialisme.'

Doubtless the Government understood, though, naturally, in public and by its press, it professed to consider the ' affaire des Inventaires ' as clerico-political and inspired

from Rome. No one, probably, realized better than M. Briand that throughout France there was surprise and, in places, real indignation on the part of the people, which expressed itself in the manifestations and served for a time as a check, and also as a warrant to M. Briand that his intelligent comprehension that the Government might go too far was justified ; and thus merely as a matter of prudence, he could claim some acquiescence in, or at least impatient watching of his policy ; a desire for peace and as much approximate fairness in a campaign of destruction as should cost neither place nor power. But the Government has been kept to some extent at bay by a far weightier influence than the ' *affaire des Inventaires* '—by the Spirit of Unity, which makes the Church in France in its hour of material ruin strong with the strength of God. This could hardly have been anticipated, judging from the blowing of trumpets and flourishing of flags through the *Matin* (echoed in the *Times*) by M. Durand Morimbeau *alias* M. Henri des Houx. True, he never then mentioned schism ; he only proclaimed the trooping in of yearning Catholics longing to be freed from Papal tyranny ! But, as the *Journal des Débats* truly remarked, this glorious dawn faded away in ten numbers of the *Matin*. Not faded away : it is now shining forth in the openly schismatical Church in the confiscated Barnabite chapel, with a most irregular, so-called Bishop, and a handful of adherents, while already one of its two priests has disappeared.

Out of 60,000 French clergy some six only have been found to make *Associations cultuelles*. M. Buisson (the avowedly anti-Christian genius of the Écoles Normales, or teachers' training colleges) expressed his conviction and his hope that schism would result from *Associations cultuelles* : he expressed himself thus constantly in public, and on one particular occasion to a committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, who were considering the Separation Law as it was then before the House, *i.e.* before the law had passed. In this his hopes coincided with the fears and convictions of Professor Kuyper, as expressed in the *Journal des Débats*, February 27, 1907. Professor

Kuyper is a Professor of Theology in the Free University, Amsterdam, and a Calvinist by faith: he is also, as is well known, an ex-Prime Minister of Holland. His letter is an open one to Pasteur Lacheret of the French Églises Réformées, and laments the acceptance of the Associations Cultuelles by the French Protestants as an inevitable source of schism, and a selling of a birthright for a *potage de lentilles*. He shews in a masterly sketch how, slowly or quickly, but certainly, the spirituality must be invaded and taken possession of by the temporality. It seems surely probable that had the Free Church of Scotland been asked on such terms to benefit by the compromise in the matter of buildings and endowments in the late *cause célèbre*, it would have indignantly refused; and the writer of this article cannot imagine similar conditions being seriously proposed to, or accepted by, the authorities of the Church of England in the event of disestablishment and disendowment. It can hardly be a matter of surprise that at the first meeting of the French Episcopate after the Separation, to the demand from Rome whether it was possible or no to accept the Separation Law such as it is, the Associations Cultuelles included, all the three Cardinals and all the Bishops, except two, voted solidly that it was not possible.

Thus, so far, the unity of the Church remaining intact, and public worship continuing, the mass of the people hardly realize any serious danger to religion in essentials; and, as in the matter of the Inventories, so lately in that of the 'Contracts' between curés and maires for the assured use for eighteen years (the longest term of communal leases) of the confiscated churches, a very large proportion of the country expressed itself on the side of the Church when it thought personal religious interests involved. As to the proposed contracts, the mayor is merely the mouth-piece of the municipal councils, of which he is chairman, and therefore it is interesting that even in such a diocese as Dijon with its Radical municipalities, out of 515 communes only seven refused their curés' proposition for a contract. In the Besançon diocese there were eight refusals out of



680. In some other dioceses there have been even fewer, in many about the same average, with here and there rather more refusals or no answers, as the officials are waiting to see how the tide flows. But the great majority all over France shewed goodwill. This is now only of interest on that account as a referendum, for M. Clémenceau's spoke in M. Briand's wheel brought the matter to a deadlock. The stipulations as to repairs were manifestly impossible, and those as to the non-employment of foreigners ridiculous—a trap too open to deceive the dullest in France; the non-employment of any of the 'regular' clergy as curés was a condition wholly outside the province of the State; and considering that before the expulsions the number of regular priests was less than 10,000, the idea of their ousting more than four times their number (curés only are here in question) is so absurd that again no French Catholic really behind the scenes and really honest on these matters would be found to subscribe to the expression of any such fear.

The goodwill as to the churches has also been shewn as to the presbyteries, so far as has been possible having regard to the fact that here it is not the municipal councils but the Prefect who has the last word in the matter; and the Prefect represents the Government. The Separation Law, in making over the presbyteries to the communes, fettered the gift by a special injunction investing the Prefect with the ultimate decision by assigning to him the approval or annulling of the decisions of the municipal councils. But for this, the presbyteries, like all other communal property, would have been independent of the Prefects. The presbyteries where Associations Cultuelles exist (as with the Protestants for instance) fall to the communes in four years—*i.e.* in 1910: where, as in the Catholic Church, there are no Associations Cultuelles they do so immediately. The consequence of allowing the ultimate decision to the Prefect, not to the municipal councils, is, that whereas in a large majority of cases the municipalities were willing to leave to the curés the free use of their houses, and in others proposed a nominal rent, the Prefects have

almost invariably overruled and insisted, not only on rent but often on high rent, which not infrequently has resulted in a homeless curé or *temporarily* in a curé-less commune. We say temporarily, since, so far, the result of such a solution in many communes has been that the distressed inhabitants have forced the mayor to make terms with the bishop and, if necessary, reparation in order to recover the curé and the open church. The Bishop of Dijon allows the writer to quote the following out of several instances in his diocese. A presbytery in very bad condition was assessed at 10*l.* a year by the municipal council for the use of three rooms in all but ruins, the outhouse where the curé kept his wood having been taken from him, and also his garden, in order to enlarge the public way. He had been curé many years, and was supposed to be much appreciated. By his bishop's orders he left the parish. In a day or two the bishop received a petition signed by three-quarters of the inhabitants declaring themselves innocent and in despair. This was followed by a visit from the mayor, driven by his weeping wife. The interview is too long to chronicle here, though from a humorous point of view it well merits a place; suffice it to say that finally the mayor declared he could not return without the promise of a re-opened church and restored curé, whom he said everyone loved! The bishop named his terms. First, that the curé should be properly lodged at the expense of the commune, and, secondly, that a fine should be paid in penitence, to be applied to the needs of the Culte. The fine was relatively heavy; the mayor groaned, then proposed that the curé should collect it, finally capitulated and departed, shaking hands with the bishop, to return with the money in a few days. The village is again in peace with a re-opened church.

In another village, where the schoolmaster rules the mayor and his colleagues, the excellent curé was expelled, and the presbytery (in good condition) let over his head. The church is closed by the same bishop. The sick and dying, and babies likely to die, receive the sacraments from an authorized neighbouring curé, and to him go the children preparing for their first communion. Lately, the

mayor applied to this curé to marry him at three o'clock P.M. in the now closed church of the commune. The curé referred him to the bishop, and to the bishop went the mayor with the confession that his future wife insisted on marriage in church. The bishop decreed that the marriage should take place in the neighbouring parish at seven o'clock in the morning, and in three minutes, *i.e.* without Mass, or music, or show of any kind. Sorrowfully the mayor retreated, but thankful even for this. The inhabitants of his commune and around are openly scornful of his disgrace, and say that he deserves it, for, indeed, the *bon curé* had not merited such treatment as expulsion after many years among them. Another curé, to whom the people were openly desirous of leaving the use of the presbytery—a course to which the municipal council, excepting the mayor, had agreed—was charged an impossible rent by command of the Prefect, who also had his adjutant in the schoolmaster. The curé instead of saying high Mass, announced from the pulpit that there would be none, and that he was leaving by order of his bishop. The congregation dispersed, and consternation possessed the village. The mayor called shortly after on the bishop, who said :

‘ You have been to the Lodge [*i.e.* of Freemasons], M. le Maire ? ’

‘ Yes, Monseigneur. ’

‘ And you received permission to come to me ? ’

‘ Yes, Monseigneur. ’

‘ But before you did so you went to M. le Préfet to make sure ? ’

‘ Yes, Monseigneur. ’

‘ And now what have you to ask ? ’

‘ The commune is in despair and claims M. le Curé and their Mass. ’

‘ Well, they must thank you, M. le Maire, and the schoolmaster and M. le Préfet. ’

‘ But what can I do ? ’ said the Mayor ; ‘ the commune will not stand losing their Culte. ’

The bishop required the re-institution of the curé in the

presbytery at a nominal rent, and the mayor returned well content.

In another part of France a curé has been installed as caretaker at a salary of 6*l.* a year to meet the exigencies of the Prefect. In yet another part a talented curé has a standing order from the Conseil Municipal to decorate the 'Maierie,' and his salary is generous. In a department not at all expected to shew an independent spirit, the Prefect having annulled the decision of the Conseil Municipal, the said Conseil Municipal reassembled and voted the 'annulation' of the Prefect '*considérée comme nulle.*' This is hardly law and order, but it shews that some of the people in France are neither wholly indifferent to the Church nor wholly content with the details of the Government legislation and the administration thereof.

If the churches were closed owing to the action of the Government, then and then only could it even approximately be judged from the next General Election for how much religion counts in France. But let there be no mistake: if the elections were given against the anti-Christian Government, against the Freemasons,<sup>1</sup> great indeed would be the surprise to the transplanted Briton, who realizes the hold which the Republic now has on the people, and their identification of the Republic with the Government—*i.e.*, at this time, with the extreme Republicans; and realizes also the almost irresistible machinery of Freemasonry, which sucks into its system the life of the people. This identification of the Ministry of the day, of the Government, with the Republic, is the modern version of '*l'État c'est moi*' of Louis XIV.; and the centralized autocracy of Richelieu's fatal imagining now flourishes in the gross abundance of a rank, poisonous vegetation in the ever more closely centralized Government bureaucracy, spreading itself in the name of the Republic, expressing its petty tyranny under the name of Liberty, and defaming the

<sup>1</sup> It is hardly necessary to remind our readers that Freemasonry in France is entirely different from Freemasonry in England, and is not recognized by the latter.



fair name and ideal of a Republic by what is contrary to justice, truth, liberty, equality, fraternity.

The words 'Ancien Régime,' stripped of exaggeration, and as interpreted by that great Frenchman and philosopher, Taine, are impregnated with the pathos of something lost, something misunderstood, rather than of intentional intolerance, tyranny, cruelty, oppression, as represented in the History of France prepared for primary school education, and exaggerated even beyond this by Freemason propaganda in the country districts and in socialistic headquarters in the towns. Opportunities, it is true, were missed, lost ; there were paradoxes of selfishness and self-sacrifice, of utter idleness and frivolity fostered by circumstances and changing into action and purpose when the rare occasion explained its call. The upper classes (as a rule : for to this as to all generalizations there were many exceptions), were taken up with the serious occupation of Court idleness, functions and pageantry. The middle class were busy in town and country in commerce ; as *avocat* and *notaire* ; as *intendants* and *fermiers-généraux* ; judges and administrators generally, working from the central heads in Paris and provincial capitals. It was these men who, trained in habits of business, became and remain the parliamentarian, the administration, the executive. The lower classes under the *ancien régime*, ignored as to rights or thoughts, suffered with sublime patience, and now in France are somewhat in the position of which children have possessed themselves in the United Kingdom and the United States ; in past centuries practically ignored, they are now in the twentieth century in possession of the situation, in all the vigour of raw youth and reactionary self-assertion, much increased by the weakness and ineptitude of rulers and parents, and the uncertainty as to responsibilities as well as rights, and duties as well as amusements (this applies of course to children), which seems to pervade the minds of all but the very old in the present year of grace ! ' Under the *ancien régime* ' really means to most people the time just before the great French Revolution ; but all along, including the last centuries, the French clergy were practi-

cally, though not nominally, very much mixed up in the three classes—upper, middle, lower—and shared their social habits. Also, to a much greater extent than is often understood, the clergy mitigated the hard lot of the lowest classes, and purified the ideas and lives of the upper and middle classes. The injustices, severities, and such cruelties as there were of the *ancien régime*, were part of the *ethos* of the age, in France as elsewhere. The writer remembers Mr. Lecky insisting that this was too often forgotten, and that in France the excessive centralization of administration accounted for much.

It would be unjust to reproach Dr. Clifford with the inconsistencies of the Nonconformists who left home and all for conscience sake to inaugurate—in New England, for instance—their own Inquisition and penal laws. Is it not perhaps equally unjust to reproach the descendants of the *notaire* and *avocat*, of the *fermiers-généraux*, of the smaller professional classes, and of other less exalted representatives of the *ancien régime*, who now flourish and bear rule in France, with having learnt nothing of liberty or justice? That which now happens with regard to Government employés, especially to those serving in the Army and Navy, who were or are still Christian, is well known. The Government if not actively inquisitorial at first hand, at least encourages the system by subordinates and uses the information in a manner which answers in its effect to the old Test Act in England.

Only the present French test is ‘*not to go to Mass*’—and is in a day and in a country in which the rights of liberty of conscience are supposed to be understood. The writer is aware that for all this the excuse alleged is the reaction from past persecution by the Church or clerical tyranny and clericalism. From the time of the Revolution at any rate the account of the Church and its clergy certainly has its balance on the credit side, and it cannot be wondered at that the gross blasphemies and indecencies of the Revolution prejudiced the lovers of order and reverence in favour of the recovery of authority by other rulers. Under Napoleon I. there is no sign, when once the Concordat

was established, of any interference in politics by the clergy; the 'Terreur Blanche' in the hot-blooded South, after the final fall of Napoleon, was political not clerical, as is shewn by the fact that Protestants and Catholics were to be found side by side on both sides. Peace restored, under Louis XVIII., a sceptic at heart, there was no clericalism. Under Charles X. there was, but with all its narrowness and arbitrariness from a human point of view and apart from any question of morality, it would have been far preferable for peace and security to live as a *libre-penseur* under that régime, than for a Catholic now who is not absolutely independent of the Government in its most humble relationships.

The root of most cruelty and all arbitrariness and oppression is ignorance, fear, stupidity and cunning. And in France no doubt these influences, which shaped the errors of the past, of the *ancien régime*, are responsible for much of the errors of the present Government. Fear of losing power and place explains much; and the general degeneracy is much increased by an untrue and unreal habit of thought, bred from the doctrines of the Encyclopædists ill-digested and arbitrarily applied, and heated and endued with emotional existence by the philosophy of Rousseau.<sup>1</sup> But further in trying to unravel the present situation in France, it cannot sufficiently be remembered that the opportunities for mistakes and oppression are intensified and multiplied by the fatal power of centralization which nets the universal suffrage with a completeness hardly to be realized by anyone in another country. One of the most regrettable consequences of the present régime is the inevitable discontent and at least half-hearted tolerance of the present state of things on the part of all who have at heart the welfare of the people and the morals and integrity of public life; who care for honour and truth,

<sup>1</sup> The writer would venture to recommend M. Jules Lemaitre's *Studies on Rousseau*, lately published, as a remarkable contribution to understanding France at the present day. M. Emile Faguet's *Anti-Cléricalisme* (Société française d'Imprimerie: 15 rue Cluny, Paris) may also be suggested for perusal.

liberty, equality and fraternity ; who care for their country. The sense of general dissatisfaction among the intellectual and professional classes, among men who not only have no prepossessions in favour of monarchy but also are often *libre-penseurs*, and without the faintest suspicion of clericalism ; unless they be suspected, as Jules Simon tells us that he was suspected, because he resisted illiberality and denounced the name of anti-clericalism for the tool it was, a weapon forged by Gambetta, or as a war-cry, well designed to excite thoughtless passion and to appeal to prejudice. Had the Third Republic been used to develop noble ideas and love of country, to guarantee respect of conscience to all alike, how different would now be the state of France : how different the feelings for its Government. We venture to assert that the Royalist parties, insignificant as they are, would then be of the same political importance as the White Rose and Jacobite Associations in England ; and this not because there are not doubtless in France many who cling with passionate affection to the names and families of those whose ancestors were served by their own ancestors, but because the French are a logical people, and had there been now a *régime* of justice and religious peace, it would have been recognized that the decision of the National Assembly in 1871 had given in the Republic liberty, justice, peace, and prosperity.

But the mass of the people have neither time to think nor to trouble themselves with details ; for them the Government is the Republic, the Republic is the Government, and doubly justified in its claim on their allegiance since the Republican form of Government was decided upon in 1871-3 by the Monarchical National Assembly returned to power by universal suffrage. The mass of the people chose a Monarchical National Assembly ; the said Assembly chose a President, M. Thiers, for the Third Republic. Also since the great Revolution the Monarchical experiments have failed from one cause or another, have collapsed from internal weakness or external catastrophe or both combined ; and though the Republican experiments have also had their vicissitudes and trans-



formations, yet the difference is as immense in the expectations unconsciously entertained or the importance attached, as it is between the importance attached to the measles or growing pains of the young or to illness in the old ; to mistakes, however grievous, in the untried or undisciplined, and to similar failures in the trained and experienced. To the present writer it seems that even if the Spectre of the *ancien régime* had not been and were not still worked unceasingly to scare the less widely read citizens of the Third Republic, the dread of war (particularly among the agricultural population), of revolution among the trades and business classes, and of disturbing the 'Caisse d'épargnes' (savings bank) and savings generally among all classes, give the re-established Republic an immense advantage. It is invested with an immense *kudos*, which means to the Ministry, the Government (now the extreme Radical party), an immense 'cover.' 'With this Government we have no war ; we have had fine harvests,' is an argument repeated times without number, though it is coupled, as often as not, with regrets for such anti-Catholic legislation as may have touched the speaker's personal experience. Working men, small farmers, tradespeople, small Government *fonctionnaires* even, have freely regretted to the writer the expulsion of the 'Sœurs' from the schools, of the Religious Orders from the country (where they were locally known and especially were useful to the commune), of the ousting of the Christian Brothers in many places, as a terrible loss to primary education and in the 'professional' schools they used to hold. Regrets also are often expressed at the change in the hospitals from the kindly nuns, who tended the sick for the love of God, to the half-trained or untrained women who, in several hospitals known to the writer, refuse the smallest attentions unless paid for them. It is only fair to add that they do this because they themselves are so miserably paid that they have to eke out their income by these means indoors and by others out of doors.

As we have said, the people in general, so far as can be judged, are not blind to the consequences of the policy of

the Government. But such regrets as they express end almost invariably—we speak from experience :

‘ But what will you ? The Government finds it necessary : the Government has its reasons doubtless ; with this Government we have no war ; the harvests are good [this, in agricultural districts]. We are better off than before the Revolution ; the Republic is best ; the schools are better in all except religion and needlework. Manners were better, it is true. It is a pity, all the same ; they did no harm, the religious, and many did much good ; and the children were better brought up (*mieux élevés*). Now there is no discipline: they have no respect, not even for parents ; but what will you ? the Government knows best : I vote for the Government, which is the Republic.’

Reference has already been made to the influence of Franc-Maçonnerie in political life. Only by living in France among the French as a French subject, not as a passing visitor, nor even settled and resident in an English *milieu*, is it possible to realize accurately the meaning and power of Freemasonry in France. Living in France has forced the writer, contrary to former prepossessions, to realize that Freemasonry is the only perfect political organization in France (and most admirable from the point of view of machinery it is) ; and also that it is absolutely and actively anti-Christian. It is so far protected by the State, that it is the only Association tacitly sanctioned and not subject to the law for Associations (1881). So too its literature is the only literature excused from the law which requires every book, pamphlet and newspaper published, to be delivered to the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Its organization spreads like a spider’s web over the whole of France. In every commune is either a responsible Freemason or adherent, who watches and reports. Through him every request has to pass to the Government bureaux ; through him every answer and favour reaches the commune. From the experience of the writer this representative of the Grand Orient is as often as not merely a discontented *mauvais sujet*, the ready tool of any machine. In towns the chief agents are the Freemasons themselves, not merely adherents, and by interest or by genuine conviction anti-Christian.

Since the Franco-Prussian war the influence of the Grand Orient has increased by leaps and bounds, and it will not be denied that it has found its support in the more Jacobin wing of the Republicans, and its protectors (not always only negatively) in Protestants and Israelites—a fact bewailed by not a few of their co-religionists. Were it only a charge made by Roman Catholics it would not be chronicled here, but the writer has heard it explained by French Protestants on the ground that ‘the Freemasons are the real power of the Left and Extreme Left (Radical), and that they [the Protestants and Jews] gain more from that party than from moderate Republicans or, of course, from Conservatives. There is no question of any danger now to liberty of conscience to any but Catholics, and they now would not interfere with Protestants nor even with Israelites.’

Freemasonry has an immeasurable influence in the General, as in all, elections, and its power is not limited to the return of the deputies under its orders. Candidates of special importance such as M. Cailloux and M. Jaurès, *although known to have been beaten, to have received less votes than their opponents*, in May 1906, took their seats boldly as the lawful deputies. This was stated at the time in the French Press generally, is openly known in France, and has never been publicly denied. There is practically no redress, since in France the validity of elections is judged, as it was formerly in England, by the Chamber of Deputies itself. Thus MM. Cailloux and Jaurès decide the validity of their own elections ! Only when the validity of a member of the Opposition is questioned serious steps are taken. Such a case which has lately greatly interested the French, but seems to have escaped the notice of the English press, is that of M. Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, son of the distinguished political economist. In May 1906 he fought for and won his seat in Montpellier, as a Republican-Nationalist : *i.e.* for the Republic as a Patriot, but not with the present Government. His victory was so wholly unexpected that the campaign and the final count had been left to their natural working. At the very end of the year his election was declared invalid on the finding of a select local committee of inquiry appointed

presumably for their lack of any claim to trustworthiness or impartiality. The election had been called in question as late as might be to prevent, if possible, Leroy-Beaulieu re-presenting himself to the same list of electors. However, he was too quick and on the alert: he lost not an hour; despite unceasing anonymous threats, despite a violent assault in which his hat suffered instead of his head; despite a midnight attack (to be accurate it was 11.30 P.M.) on his return from one of his last meetings, when he was fired at and badly wounded, he persisted and again triumphantly won. The seat was supposed to be so safe for the Jacobin candidate that M. Leroy-Beaulieu's return had greatly provoked his opponents—the Freemasons above all. The would-be murderers were too gently pursued to be caught and remain comfortably at large! The class of deputy desired by the Freemasons was well described by Jules Simon in 1887:

‘ Now they have one qualification, because it is established that to be worthy of confidence it is only necessary to have never received any proof of confidence.<sup>1</sup> The art of becoming a deputy is not at all the same thing as the art of becoming a good deputy. To be a good deputy you must study in the college for political and administrative science: to be simply a deputy it is enough that your name be on the list of the committee (page 17); and who is at this moment in this country the dupe the most duped? The people! It is the universal suffrage. They say to the people, “ Don’t go and begin over again the tricks of the Empire, which gave you apparently the right to vote but really imposed official candidates.” If they dare, the people answer: “ If the Préfet has a candidate, it is just the one for whom I will not vote. I am not master to be kept in leading strings, but to choose my delegates myself, without following the orders or the advice of anyone, whosoever it may be.” “ See,” is the reply, “ here is the list we have made for you at Reims (or at Paris or at Chalons, &c.). Make sure to vote accordingly without changing . . . and when the time comes, despite all the canvassing and intrigues which will beset you, put your paper bravely in the urn to assure your power and confound your enemies.” “ Certainly: I shall not even look at the list. It is enough for me it is that of the Committee [Caucus]. The Com-

<sup>1</sup> *Nos Hommes d’État*, p. 22 (Calmann Lévy).



mittee has looked well into the matter. It has made the programme which is my programme ; it is a good list ; any way, it is the one I prefer. The reactionaries hoped to see me yield to my fancies ; strike out one name, put in another . . . but I'll not play their game ! I shall vote *en bloc* (in a lump) eyes shut, for the list of the Committee just as it is, and they will see who is master !''<sup>1</sup>—'And,' Jules Simon continues (p. 15), ' So it is for all elections . . . thus we are now the property of these Committees . . . and the result is that the universal suffrage whose object was to make the people sovereign, in effect makes the people slaves.'

It is peculiarly difficult to gauge the real mind of the mass of the French people, since they seem to have less a sense of an active responsibility than of a chronic fear of not being supposed to be as good or rather better (socially) than their neighbours ; of being taken advantage of ; of being put upon ; of some possible disadvantage or injury ; and since the growing tone of the modern French schoolmaster in primary schools, the 'instituteur' (there are exceptions), cultivates this spirit, since the whole tenour of the 'Gauche' is to pander to this nervously irritable vanity, inevitably 'I shall vote eyes shut' at the orders of the Caucus of the Left (the extreme Republicans). But further, if, as has hitherto been the case, any change should break this blind following of the Government, identified mentally with the 'État,' 'the Republic,' should it come violently, the mind of the people expressed in a passion, even if in a righteous passion, cannot be said to ensure permanent good, or the result of sober reflection. It all seems reaction after reaction, with intervals of torpor in one autocracy or another. The present mental atmosphere of France strikes the observer as highly irritable and feverishly unhealthy, the only oases of self-control and purer air being among Christians and Christian centres in men and women who live near to Christ in the gracious power of His Sacramental Life. And in this time of ecclesiastical disturbance especially, it is

<sup>1</sup> In the *Scrutin de liste* here referred to, the elector voted for all the Deputies or Senators of the department. Now the elector votes only for the one deputy of his own *arrondissement* (division of a department or town)—votes for the name, instead of the list, ordered by the Caucus.

remarkable in bishops and clergy, in the very few remaining groups of nuns and the order of St. Vincent de Paul and Little Sisters of the Poor—in the laicized who have gathered up the fragments and bravely begun again to feed the multitude therewith. But one comes across such lay men and women in all classes ; and beautiful souls among the poor, just as at home in England.

It seems inevitable that to an Englishman the elections in France should represent the will of the people deliberately moving in all anti-Catholic legislation, and among the most important, the most important in its consequences in the national life, is the 'establishing of complete public control over elementary education,' which 'necessarily takes an anti-Christian character,' because 'it is assumed that Christianity is politically impossible,' 'since the Church has become intolerable,' 'Churchman and Christian have been identical terms' and 'the majority of French citizens have been led by their experience of denominational monopoly to a disgust of Christianity itself.'

Whatever may be the grounds on which it is attempted to defend the attacks in England on denominational religion as part of the movement for establishing popular control in education, we are bold to assert that never would 'the majority of Frenchmen,' the 'majority of French citizens' in any circumstances have regarded undenominationalism as a definitely Christian religion. Sir Leslie Stephen's essay on the impossibility of unsectarian Christianity exactly expresses the clear French mind. But there is not, nor ever has been, in France 'a movement for secular education' other than that of a small body expressed and led by Jules Ferry and Paul Bert, which from being the thought of the comparatively few became the tool of Freemasonry. It is possible, though not probable, that in such unimaginable circumstances as France enjoying the richly varied spiritual diet of England, Freemasonry might have smiled at a Cowper-Temple clause conceived in the hopeful light of the dawning New Theology ; but that the intellectual vanity of the most logical of nations should ever seriously tolerate and be responsible for such incoherences

is unimaginable ; while, as to the Freemasons, it must be remembered that even in such incoherences they would run terribly near making the Government responsible for the recognition of God. The writer is convinced that there was no sort of popular desire in 1880 for secular education, nor has there been any general desire for its substitution for religious education. But this does not mean that there has not resulted already an immense amount of ignorance and indifference, and often, where fostered by the schoolmasters, positive hatred of Christianity.<sup>1</sup> But a proof that not only there was not but there is not any general popular desire for secular schools to the exclusion of religious schools lies in the fact that the religious schools still existing are full, and many to overflowing ; while those reopened by the laicized hold their ground or actually increase in numbers. In a very Radical small town known to the writer this is so much the case that the re-opened laicized Christian Brothers' school gains as steadily as the secular communal school loses ; in another town a small pork-butcher was bribed by offers of custom if he would send his boys to the Government school, but he refused and sends his boys to the re-opened school of the laicized Christian Brothers. An Association called 'Pères de Famille' was organized by M. Bornet of Lyons, in 1902, to defend the reconstituted voluntary schools after their destruction by M. Combes. M. Bornet was the author of a very remarkable book, *L'École libre de Demain*. In 1903 associations of the 'Pères de Famille' were founded in Lyons and around. A Congress was held and 200 associations were represented by delegates. Thirty-four thousand five hundred scholars belonged to the voluntary schools so organized. The National Congress for the Administration

<sup>1</sup> Jules Simon's words have already been quoted. The readers of this article are referred to a little volume, *Nos Hommes d'État* (Calmann Lévy, 1887), to an article, 'Silence aux Mères,' to another—a series—'Le Cléricalisme voilà l'ennemi,' and to the concluding series which represent (though written more than twenty years ago) what is now going on, with the exception of the last article, which represents his ideas of what might be under a Republic ruled in the faith of liberty, equality and fraternity.

of Voluntary schools met at Lyons in 1904, and the Report gives accurate details, including all that specially regards the Lyons 'Pères de Famille.' Not the least useful part of the work of this Society is watching the schoolmasters and the teaching; protesting alike against anti-Christian and anti-patriotic teaching and anti-militarism. In other parts of France known to the writer, similar associations are doing excellent work, but are less formally organized, and it is therefore doubtful if they would continue independently of their moving spirits. Secular education is, as has been said, the work of Jules Ferry and Paul Bert, and has served the Freemasons' turn admirably.<sup>1</sup>

There is not space here to chronicle more than a very few cases of the very many known to the writer, of the sacrifices of the working people at this juncture of their Church's fortunes. A small general shopkeeper in the north-west of France brought 40*l.* as 'tout mon possible'; a servant in a farm earning 8*l.* a year brought 3*l.*; a very poor peasant woman ten francs; a workman 4*l.*; and many more did the like—all *pour le culte* since the spoliation. In Paris a small carpenter brought five francs as a monthly subscription from *ma bourgeoisie et moi*. Factory girls in another parish give a day's work once a month; a workroom elsewhere offered the earnings of a day a week. The cases in town and country known to the writer of hardly earned savings given, and daily necessities cut down even lower for the sake of the Church, prove that the hold of the Church on the people of France is firm. The transplanted Briton has been impressed by the fact that in those who believe and make efforts and sacrifices, there is no superstition whatever; it is the living Christ whom they see assailed, and the living Christ whom they serve and defend. Looking back it is wonderful that, despite the constantly disturbing influences, the shocks of revolution, the weaknesses and mistakes from within,

<sup>1</sup> Lately M. Maurice Barrès of the Institut de France made a remarkable speech on the urgent necessity of organization to resist the poisonous teaching of the majority of the national school teachers trained in the Écoles Normales.



the hindrances and persecutions from without, the Catholic Church in France has held on, and far from really losing ground, is able now in the hour of material ruin, to step out in increased and increasing spiritual strength. The priests are beginning to follow their bishops in the freedom of poverty out into workshop and market; field and barn; *auberge* and factory; in theatres and halls, to find the people who have from ignorance, indifference, or from fear of man, forsaken their worship, while the *Écoles normales* provide teachers who are more and more the missionaries of scepticism.

Since this was written copies of the Montagnini papers have passed from their present owners to the French Press. Doubtless there can be no dependence upon the accuracy of such copies so given—but such as they are, not a word is there which affects the opinions and statements in this article.

SOPHIA M. PALMER,  
COMTESSE DE FRANQUEVILLE.

---

## SHORT NOTICES

### I.—BIBLICAL STUDIES.

*The Apocalypse of St. John.* The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices. By H. B. SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (London: Macmillan, 1906.) 15s.

IN this edition of the Apocalypse Dr. Swete has followed the same plan as he adopted in editing St. Mark. He prints a continuous text with *apparatus criticus* and exegetical notes on the same page. This is the method of all the great Cambridge commentaries. Probably it is more expensive than the method of most Continental editions, which omit the text, but there can be no question that it is much pleasanter to use. The text and notes are prefaced by eighteen chapters dealing with the general questions of Introduction. Finally there is a valuable index of

Greek words, as well as one to the notes and introduction, and some instructive maps and photographs.

All these divisions—text, notes and introduction—are an advance on anything previously existing in English. They are of course scholarly in every sense, and shew that exact knowledge of Greek and philological nicety which has always been the brightest feature of English work. Naturally, however, it has the defects of its quality ; so that while one is grateful for what is given, one is inclined to regret what has been withheld from a refinement of caution, and this is true of each division.

The text is probably the best which has yet been published, and the *apparatus criticus* contains information which could not easily be found elsewhere. It is perhaps a pity that Dr. Swete felt obliged in some cases to introduce a fresh notation, but the reviewer agrees that it was probably necessary to do so.<sup>1</sup> But it is disappointing not to be given more help towards the grouping of the authorities for the text. A reference to the works of Weiss, Bousset, Hausleiter and Gwynn, and a quotation from Dr. Hort, do not seem sufficient. No doubt the explanation is that Dr. Swete found it impossible to obtain clear-cut and certain results ; but he must have noted many points of importance, and be in a position to state where the problem really lies. Can he not be induced to publish something of his views on these points ?

The questions chiefly discussed at present with regard to the Apocalypse are its unity, its authorship and date. On these Dr. Swete has naturally much to say. His position may briefly be described. The writer of the Apocalypse was either the Apostle John the son of Zebedee, or John the Elder ; probably the former view is preferable, but the alternative is not at present to be excluded. He wrote in the time of Domitian, and probably between 90 and 96. The Apocalypse is definitely a single complete work, and although the writer made use of any materials to which he had access he did not transfer them in such a manner

<sup>1</sup> It is worth pointing out that the description of Codex Kosinitsanus, on p. clxxxii, suggests a distinction between Drama and Kosinitzi. If so, this is a mistake, owing to von Soden's disregard of the traditional notation. 'Kosinitzi' (or Kosiphoinitzi) is the name generally given to a monastery in Macedonia, about twenty miles away from Drama, and perhaps a little further from Cavalla. This name probably means 'the monastery of the blackbird' (Kosouphos) and is quite old ; but in official language it is called Eikosiphoinissai : whether it is original is open to question, but von Soden has adopted it and added 'Drama' in order to indicate its position.

as to make his book a 'compilation, or to detract from its unity.' These results are justified in the introduction; in each case the arguments for the result reached are carefully and impartially stated, but probably many students of the Apocalypse will feel that the arguments for different conclusions are not rendered sufficiently intelligible or always quite justly treated. As between John the Apostle and John the Elder, nothing could be more fairly stated; so much must be allowed even by those whose judgement inclines towards the view which Dr. Swete rejects. But little or nothing is said as to the possibility that the book is pseudonymous. Surely it is a point of great importance that all contemporary, and probably all existing, Apocalypses are pseudonymous. Dr. Swete seems to imply that his view that the book was written by a Christian prophet excludes this possibility here. But granting that this is true, it nevertheless remains the fact that this Christian prophet was writing in the style of a Jewish Apocalypticus, and the question is whether the name John is part of the Apocalyptic style—a pseudonym—or is genuinely intended to be taken as the name of the prophet. Does not this point require discussion quite as much as the distinction between John the Apostle and John the Elder? It does not seem quite fair to say, 'We cannot yet with safety go far beyond the dictum of Dionysius'—'that the writer of these things then is John we must believe himself when he says so; but what like is this [John] is uncertain'—when the majority of Continental writers, as well on the New Testament as on Apocalyptic literature, would consider that the dictum quoted begs the whole question.

Similar criticism is invited by Dr. Swete's treatment of the allied questions of unity of the book and the interpretation which should be given to it. His main argument in defending the unity of the Apocalypse is the occurrence of similar phrases throughout the book, and the general unity of style. To the reviewer it seems that the last argument is very strong and has often been much neglected. It gains strength if we consider the somewhat similar question of style in relation to the use of documentary sources in the Synoptic Gospels. Here the facts are much clearer, and give at least *prima facie* reason for thinking that when a first-century writer used various sources he would be likely to leave traces of the fact in variations of style. Therefore, the strongly characteristic style which can be traced throughout the Apocalypse is a valid reason for doubting the use of documentary sources. This argument has never been

stated better than by Dr. Swete. On the other hand, the exegetical argument appears to scholars of the school of Bousset to point even more strongly to the compositeness of the Apocalypse, and this argument Dr. Swete does not make sufficiently plain. In shewing the linguistic unity of the book he adopts the always instructive method of arranging the points of agreement between different parts in parallel columns ; but in mentioning the exegetical divergences he contents himself with a list of passages (p. xlviii) and a reference to the commentary. This is regrettable, for it gives a far less clear impression of the strength of the case, and probably no one who was unacquainted with other commentaries would recognize that the fundamental question is whether the superficial evidence of style in favour of an essential unity ought to control the exegesis, or the superficial evidence of exegetical difficulties ought to control the critical judgement as to unity. Which line ought to be followed is still a problem, but those who take the former view ought to read Bousset, and those who incline to the latter will do well to study Dr. Swete. The pity of it is that each class is likely to do exactly the opposite.

If in these respects Dr. Swete's book falls short of perfection, it would give a wrong impression to end on the note of criticism when there is so much more which demands gratitude. His work is likely to remain for many years as the best English commentary, and no one, of whatever nationality, will be able to neglect it.

*The Bible in Wales.* A Study in the History of the Welsh People, with an Introductory Address and a Bibliography. By JOHN BALLINGER, Librarian of the Central Library, Cardiff. (London : Sotheran and Co., 1906.) By Subscription.

JUST two years ago we had occasion to review in these pages Archdeacon Thomas' scholarly *Life and Work of Bishop Davies and William Salesbury*, which dealt chiefly with the labours of the sixteenth century pioneers of Welsh Biblical translation.<sup>1</sup> We have now before us a work which treats of the whole history of Scriptural translation in Wales from the times of Davies and Salesbury down to the present day ; while this brief but adequate historical account is supplemented by a Bibliography with notes, consisting of some ninety pages, wherein every Bible and Testament published in the Welsh language has

<sup>1</sup> C.Q.R., April 1905. 'Translators of the Welsh Bible.'



been recorded down to the close of the year 1900. It is almost needless to add that Mr. Ballinger has carried out this task of compilation with care and thoroughness, and the Bibliography of *The Bible in Wales* will prove invaluable to the student or lecturer. The illustrations contain several facsimile reproductions of interesting letters, and also of the title pages of Salesbury's New Testament of 1567 and of Bishop Morgan's Bible of 1588, and of other exceedingly rare Welsh books.

The first extant printed translation of any portion of the Bible is connected with a name little known outside the Principality, that of Sir John Prys, or Prise, of Brecon, whose 'Welsh Calendar' of 1546 contains the Lord's Prayer, the Decalogue and three verses from the New Testament in his native tongue. The second printed translation of 1551, known as the *Llith a ban* and consisting of the Gospels and Epistles of the Prayer Book, is from the pen of William Salesbury, the chief translator of the New Testament of 1567. In 1588 Bishop William Morgan was able to publish the whole Bible, having been greatly assisted in his task by the purse of Archbishop Whitgift and by the advice of many willing scholars, such as Dean Goodman of Westminster, and Bishops Hughes, Bellott and Vaughan. In 1620 Bishop Parry of St. Asaph produced the Authorized Version of the Welsh Bible, while in 1630 appeared the first Bible in quarto—'Beibl Bach,' or Little Bible, as it was commonly termed in Wales—published at the expense of two London Welshmen, Sir Thomas Middleton and Rowland Heylin, who fixed its price at 5s., thereby rendering this volume the first copy of the Scriptures accessible to any but the wealthy. The first Bible actually printed within the Principality was that of Peter Williams, the Methodist preacher and commentator, whose celebrated work was issued at Carmarthen in 1770. The first diglott edition of the Scriptures, with English and Welsh in parallel columns, was issued between 1823–1827, during which time the Rev. Joseph Harris ('Gomer') and J. A. Williams produced the complete work in forty-five parts at 1s. apiece for distribution to 1,500 subscribers in the counties of Glamorgan and Monmouth alone: a circumstance which easily proves the intense anxiety of the Welsh working-classes to obtain ably edited copies of the Bible even at so high a price as 2l. 5s. During the past century numberless editions of Welsh or diglott Bibles have appeared, and not a few of these have been published in America, one of the features at the largely attended exhibition of Welsh Bibles held in 1904 at the Cardiff Public

Library being a case of Welsh Testaments printed in New York.

We warmly congratulate Mr. Ballinger on having compiled from so many sources an admirable account of the Bible in Wales, which, taken in conjunction with its companion Bibliography, makes of this book a standard work of reference for all who desire to study the social and moral development of Wales; for the story of the translation and distribution of the Welsh Scriptures occupies a very important place in Cambrian annals since the Reformation, and it is a story in which, as we pointed out in the article to which we referred above, the place of Welsh Churchmen is as honourable as it is frequently forgotten.

## II.—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

*A Manual of Theology.* By JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906.) 10s. 6d.

MOST writers who have endeavoured to construct a purely Biblical theology have started with the assumption of the inspiration of the Bible; but Dr. Beet makes no such assumption. Jesus of Nazareth, to whom history points as the source of an unparalleled influence for good, left no written record; but within a few decades of His departure some nine or ten writers, whose works prove their intelligence and honesty, and whose independence corroborates their general agreement, wrote in narratives and in treatises what they knew and believed of Him. Without assuming their special inspiration, we are historically justified in taking their consentient witness as giving a true account of the Master and His doctrine; and the task which remains for the theologian is to collect and co-ordinate their statements. This Dr. Beet proceeds to do with admirable diligence and candour.

In all this we hail a return to the Catholic principle that the Person of our Incarnate Lord, and no book, however sacred, is the Revelation of God to men. But we doubt whether Dr. Beet really adheres to his purpose. Half at least of his book is based upon St. Paul's doctrine of Justification as expounded by Luther. We do not purpose to discuss this doctrine; but we cannot accept it as historically derived from the Master. The characteristic phrase, 'Justification through Faith,' is used by no one in the New Testament save St. Paul (p. 164); and the teaching of other New Testament writers, though it may be harmonized with his, is certainly not identical with it. In fact,

the doctrine in question bears such evident traces of the mind of the converted Pharisee and of the controversies in which he was engaged that we may be sure that it is not a record of the actual teaching of our Lord, but a disciple's inference from that teaching. St. Paul's analytic temper leads him to discriminate between the Faith that justifies and the Faith that sanctifies—between Salvation through faith and Salvation in obedience ; and Lutheran scholasticism goes further in this direction, to treat different aspects of a thing as distinct things ; but we believe the way of safety lies in subordinating such analysis to an earlier and wider synthesis, in which all grace is the bestowal of the Divine Life, and all faith is the reception of it. To this truth all the sacred writers in their different ways bear witness.

Dr. Beet hardly seems to give due weight to the fact that a whole generation of disciples lived before a word of the New Testament was written, and more than two generations before it was completed ; and, again, that the experience of believers in all subsequent ages forms part of our knowledge of God. The unique value of the New Testament as *proving* a religion already possessed is not to be confused with use of it as a *basis* of a religion which is to be constructed ; and Dr. Beet seems to us to use as a foundation-stone the spire which was meant to serve as a land-mark.

We have thought it well to confine our remarks to principles rather than details. We should be bound to differ from many statements as to the nature of the Church and the sacraments ; and particularly from the denial to baptized infants of the privileges of children of God (p. 411) : as if God's grace had to wait upon man's faith. We are surprised to find little or no notice of passages which speak of the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands ; of the commission to the Church to forgive sins ; of the nature and law of matrimony. Comparing this manual with some others, we miss in it the broad humanity and the literary grace of Dr. Mason's *Faith of the Gospel* and the philosophical insight of Dr. Strong ; but we do not undervalue its diligence, its sober and devout tone, and its fidelity to the truths of the Divine Unity and Trinity and the Godhead of our Lord.

### III.—RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

*A Child's Life of Christ.* By MABEL DEARMER. (London : Methuen and Co., 1906.) 6s.

We congratulate Mrs. Dearmer on the skill with which she has attempted a difficult, not to say an impossible, task. The

Evangelists themselves do not tell us the half of what we long to know, but they have set a standard which makes all subsequent Lives of Christ seem cold and disappointing. And yet each generation needs some one to write the Life of Christ in its own language and with reference to the accumulated experience of Christians, who must know more of what Christ has been to the world even than those who were eye-witnesses of His Incarnate life. To write the Life of Christ one must not only be very familiar with the holy Gospels: one must know how to bring together things new and old. Above all, the mothers of every generation must tell the old old story in a way that will reach their children's hearts, and stimulate curiosity without a word to lessen their reverence and love.

It is because Mrs. Dearmer has insight into the mind of a child as well as love and reverence for the Gospel of Christ that we cordially recommend this beautiful book, enriched as it is with Miss Brickdale's striking illustrations. The latter are unconventional and somewhat after the style of Tissot. We specially like the Nativity, and the solitary figure on the Cross labelled 'The King's Triumph.' We find the 'Empty Tomb' less suggestive and convincing than the well-known frontispiece to Dr. Latham's *Risen Master*; but the whole series are a distinct addition to the book.

Mrs. Dearmer has written down just what one would like to hear a mother say to her children with the living voice; assuming that they are intelligent children between the ages of five and ten, and therefore quite capable of receiving deep spiritual truth, it is clothed in simple language and presented in an orderly fashion.

In a careful reading of the whole we have noticed only two or three slips on points which we should have wished otherwise expressed. It seems a mistake to say of the miracle at Cana (p. 33), 'This was the first time that our Lord had used the power of the Spirit of God,' for we are sure that the author does not mean to imply that our Lord only used the power of the Holy Spirit for miraculous works. It is important to insist that all through His Incarnate life our Lord was dependent on the Holy Spirit, who acted on His humanity as He does on ours. On p. 71 it is a definite mistake to say that the first words of the Sermon on the Mount were 'Blessed are the humble.' Humility belongs to the third beatitude, and St. Matthew's first 'Blessed are the poor in spirit' must be related to St. Luke's 'Blessed are ye poor,' which is qualified and deepened by the addition of 'in spirit.' It is a great pity to miss the force of our



Lord's teaching about poverty and wealth by applying the term 'poor in spirit' to something else. That Mrs. Dearmer is not unfamiliar with the social doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount is apparent elsewhere; *e.g.* in a pointed application on p. 214 to those who make long prayers and yet live on the rents that they get from widows' houses.

It is a question how far it is wise to use a paraphrase, when children would be just as likely to understand the words of the Bible, and we have a decided preference for that reverence for the letter of Holy Scripture which attaches importance to accurate knowledge of the very words. Perhaps, however, there is a difference between the telling of the story *viva voce* and the reading from a book. A certain familiarity and use of childish language is quite tolerable in talking to a child, while the same jars a little when it is written down and so invites comparison with the Bible language.

But our readers must judge for themselves, and if any departure from familiar words is tolerable, one could scarcely find the story better told than in such a passage as this :

'Once again our Lord Jesus went up by Himself into a mountain. He had gone up into a mountain to preach the sermon that had set forth the New Law for the first time. Now He wanted all men to hear of that Law. How could this be brought about? Whenever our Lord Jesus had some great thing to accomplish, He always spent many hours in prayer. This time He prayed all night. You can think of Him alone on the mountain side, kneeling among the mountain flowers—the white daisies, the blue gentians, and the tall red lilies; you can think of Him kneeling under the quiet stars, praying to his Father for strength and guidance in the great work that lay before Him.

'All night he prayed. The sounds of the night were around him—the howl of the jackal, the hoot of the owl, and the humming of many insects. When at last the sun shewed above the mountain, touching it with light, our Lord rose from his knees. The day had come. His prayer of the night was over. He knew now what to do in order to set up the Kingdom of God upon the earth' (p. 81).

We are less satisfied with such a description as follows of the scene in the Home at Bethany, though it is certainly well calculated to interest a child and impress on his mind the characters of Martha and Mary, even if it may seem to older readers a little lacking in dignity. But on the whole the style of the book is admirable. The story of the Passion and the Resurrection is quite excellent, and we are sure that Mrs. Dearmer may count on the gratitude of both children and their teachers.

*The Way to Teach the Bible*, according to the method in use at the Church of Ireland Training College, Kildare Place, Dublin. By H. KINGSMILL MOORE, D.D. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1906.) 6s.

THIS little book is evidently the outcome of considerable experience, and the author applies to the teaching of the Bible methods which are comparatively new in England in secular subjects, and which, until quite recently, no one thought of applying to Holy Scripture. The reader will be disappointed if he expects to find fresh light on the subject matter of the Bible, or even the barest recognition of the difficulties scientific and literary which the growth of knowledge and modern criticism suggest. However, there is no lack of help to be found elsewhere by one who wishes to teach, not a new Theology but the old Theology with the fresh light that has been thrown upon it. Such a one will rather turn to Dr. Driver's *Genesis*, or the stores of Biblical learning to be found in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. But there is certainly room for a book on method, which will make the teacher realize the seriousness and importance of his calling, and the need of presenting truth in the way which is most likely to arrest the attention, and secure that the pupil shall assimilate what he is taught.

Dr. Kingsmill Moore does not claim originality for the method which has gradually been evolved in the Kildare Place Training College, and it is none the worse for being very like that employed in teaching secular subjects in the German secondary schools. It is hardly possible to do justice to a scientific treatise by extracts, but the following quotations will perhaps sufficiently indicate the scope of the book.

‘The object of the Kildare Place method is to employ a system similar to the German in connexion with religious instruction and the subject of Holy Scripture (p. 45).

‘In connexion with religion and the Bible, however, all is of permanent value, and a method is doubly precious which not only simplifies the immediate lesson, but also gives added power for dealing with the whole subject (p. 46).

‘If our method is to yield its full fruits, it must be by means of a Leading Thought which will convey religious truth’ (p. 47).

Subsequent chapters shew the teacher how to select his leading thoughts, and sub-thoughts, and this is illustrated by examples of right and wrong analyses.

We cannot say that we have found the book so suggestive

or helpful as we hoped, though we can well believe that it will be of real service to teachers who will take the trouble to master its method; but they must gain elsewhere their capacity for seeing spiritual truth and the zeal which will make them wish to impart it to others in the best possible way. The quotations from Dr. Thring, the great headmaster of Uppingham, are stimulating indeed, and we should like to see the book in the hands of those who are so foolish as to fancy that religious teaching is of such slight importance that we must not inquire whether teachers are qualified by personal conviction and adequate knowledge for a work which requires a clear head and a loving heart.

*Simple Talks to Little Children on Holy Subjects.* By LADY SNAGGE. (London: Skeffington and Co., 1906.) 3s. 6d.

THESE are just the sort of lessons for a mother to give to her quite little children on Sunday afternoons. They bring before them in very simple language the chief facts of the Christian Faith following in the main the course of the Christian year. We are sorry that a lesson has not been provided for every Sunday, for we think that the little book would then have had a more extended usefulness; and the treatment of some topics, which might be made interesting and intelligible to little children, is too slight. We have noticed very little that calls for correction, but the author seems to fall into a common mistake when she tells us, that the wise men found the Holy Child lying in a manger. St. Matthew tells us that they came into the house, not into the stable, and it seems natural to suppose that several days had elapsed and a change had taken place since the shepherds found Him in the manger. We do not agree with her derivation of Whitsun Day, and even assuming that she is right in deriving it from 'White,' the point about Holy Baptism might be much more clearly put. We do not find the same charm and power of description as in Mrs. Dearmer's *Child's Life of Christ*, but this book might well be taken as an introduction to the other, and is apparently meant for rather younger children. We wish that those whose idea of the religious instruction which Church people give their children is derived from controversial sources, could notice in such books as these, that the simplest Bible teaching implies that the teacher has in the background that conception of the Person and work of our Blessed Lord which is safeguarded by the Creed. We quite

agree that controversy is unsuitable for children, and we do not wish to emphasize the points which divide Christians from one another, but we hold that no one can teach the Bible to any purpose who has not made up his mind whether or no he is going to speak of Jesus as the Saviour of the world and the eternal Son of the Father.

#### IV.—HISTORY.

*Cambridge Modern History.* Vol. IV. *The Thirty Years' War.*  
(Cambridge University Press, 1906.) 16s. net.

In the volume before us the editors have attained a larger measure of success than in some of its predecessors, owing to the possibility of a more complete unity of treatment. A further advantage comes from the fact that two of the editors, the Master of Peterhouse and Dr. George Prothero, are specialists on the period with which it deals; and, happily, they have both contributed a considerable amount of matter. Dr. A. W. Ward's work is remarkably clear, accurate, and complete. He knows German history thoroughly and he has spared no pains to master, and to sift critically, the large mass of pamphlet literature from which so much of our knowledge of the Thirty Years' War is ultimately derived. If we may select any part for special praise, we may observe that we find the whole account of the Bohemian question, and the history of the unhappy 'Winter King,' full of vivid interest and expressed with sound historical judgement.

When we pass to the French chapters, also the work of one of the editors, Mr. Stanley Leathes, we may repeat our praise. It is difficult to say anything new about Richelieu or Mazarin, but what is well known is here very well summarized. There is, for example, an excellent statement in brief of Richelieu's ecclesiastical policy. A fuller treatment of Jansenism, however, is desirable, but that may perhaps be looked for in a later volume; though a chapter by M. Emile Boutroux, Professor in the University of Paris, treats of Descartes and Pascal with considerable skill in twenty pages which make us wish for more.

The history of the countries which lie outside the general track of European politics has been entrusted to several thoroughly competent hands. In particular, Mr. George Edmundson's section dealing with Holland is a valuable addition to our standard historical work. On the other hand, we are obliged to confess to a certain dissatisfaction as to the proportion of



the volume regarded as a whole. The year 1659-60 in England was hardly important enough to have as much space as is allowed to more than half a century of the Papacy ; and we really cannot see why Spanish literature should be disposed of in a couple of pages, while a particular school of English poetry, which had practically no influence on Europe generally, should have a whole chapter to itself. We confess, too, that we should have liked more about Italian history, and something about Italian literature. These faults, however, are perhaps inseparable from the general scheme—a scheme which we confess we have never fully understood. The editors have taken great pains to secure capable writers, to revise carefully all that is written, and to supply their readers with very full bibliographies. We have spoken before of defects : we prefer now rather to dwell upon merits, which are equally unquestionable. It is no small praise that in a work of this kind in many volumes, divided into a large number of sections allotted to different writers of different nationalities, different training and different degrees of ability, the editors have succeeded in obtaining a high standard of impartiality, as well as a high standard of accuracy. With whatever limitations, as a summary of European history the *Cambridge Modern History* will hold its own at least for our generation.

*Parish Life in Mediaeval England.* By ABBOT GASQUET.  
(London : Methuen, 1906.) 7s. 6d.

THIS is the second of two delightful volumes in the series called 'The Antiquary's Books,' in which Abbot Gasquet has described the religious life of mediæval England. In the earlier, which dealt with life in monasteries, as well as in the present book, everything is as charming, everything works as prosperously as in the prospectus with which a company promoter attracts our subscriptions. It is all so smooth that it excites suspicion, and so much time has elapsed since the transactions with which the Abbot deals that a few annual reports with the accompanying balance-sheets would have been more relevant than the amiable generalities which he supplies. There is not a word untrue, but not a hint is given that anything is being withheld ; and readers who are new to the subject will be in danger of thinking that the whole truth has been told them. If they are tempted, as they should be, by the apt quotations from Chaucer's *Parish Priest* to make the acquaintance of the other clerical characters

in the Canterbury Pilgrimage, they will resent the reticence with which the Abbot has concealed from them some of the most prominent features of mediæval parish life. But if they are content with an *ex parte* statement, they can desire nothing better than they will find here. It is true that the learned writer does not always realize the ignorance of those whom he instructs, and that sometimes more explanation is necessary than he gives ; sometimes again his statements are not full enough to be clear and to avoid apparent inconsistencies. He says, for instance, that Lyndwood gives infancy as the English age for Confirmation ; but his picture of the rite shews lusty youths as the recipients. A little space could have been well spent in reconciling the apparent discrepancy. And while an account is given of the other sacraments of mediæval England, Extreme Unction receives no description at all.

The architectural part, the most difficult, is also the weakest, though it is very instructive and for the most part clear. But the 'altar-beam' is surely not so obscure a subject as it is here represented. Was it not the normal substitute in small churches for the rood-screen ? Often enough, as at West Harnham, near Salisbury, the corbels which supported it can be seen in the east wall just above the altar, and it doubtless carried the Rood with the Virgin and St. John who in a larger building would have stood over the screen. Perhaps the most important section of the book is that which deals with the clergy and their pay. That part which deals with chantry-priests is admirable, and a real addition to popular knowledge, but we cannot say as much of the account of rectors and vicars. The responsibility for the repairs of the chancel is not stated with such precision as was possible ; and too much is made of the theoretical share of the poor in a proportion of the tithe, while nothing is said on the interesting subject of glebe-land and of incumbents as farmers. Nor is the elaborate system by which pluralities were sanctioned and even monks under the vow of poverty were enabled to hold a benefice as papal chaplains even mentioned ; nor the frequency of exchanges in the later middle ages, though this is one of the points in which change has been most striking. The history of appropriations is inadequately and misleadingly treated. No reader could understand from Abbot Gasquet's words how severe was the struggle by which the bishops forced reluctant monasteries to assign a fixed proportion of the income of their rectories to perpetual vicars, who should discharge all the duties in return for a small

share of the revenue ; and when he lays stress upon the fact that this was done with the bishops' consent he allows us to imagine that they welcomed the transaction, when in fact they were but making the best of a bad job. And he does not follow the lead of Dr. Jessopp in telling us how appropriation often lowered the social status of the parochial clergy, rectors of the patron's family being succeeded by vicars of humbler antecedents. In fact, though there are singularly few errors and ample evidence of research, this is a book which cannot be accepted as an impartial guide, but it will be of the greatest assistance to any student who will correct its one-sided presentation of the evidence by means of authorities which the author himself has pointed out.

V.—BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

*The Life and Experiences of Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.* Written by himself. (London : Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1906.) 12s. net.

IN a short Preface the author explains that the publication of this book of about 400 pages is due to the wish of several of his friends that the memoirs which he had collected for his family only should be given a much wider circulation. Those who read this book and who take an interest in the history of scientific discovery, in the development of scientific and technical education, and perhaps in politics, will feel that the friends of Sir Henry Roscoe were justified in their persuasions, and will be glad that they were successful.

The chapters which are devoted to an account of his education as a chemist and to his work in the University of Heidelberg are full of interest. They give to younger generations of chemists an insight into the character and work of the Masters with whom the author was so closely associated, which must appeal strongly to all who think with gratitude of the labours of the men who made many of the generalizations, and laid the foundations of a number of the processes and practices which have become the necessities of modern scientific life. Reading the accounts of the early work which led to discoveries so far reaching as, for example, the coincidence of the bright lines of the spectra of metals with the Fraunhofer lines of the solar spectrum, it is easy to understand the admiration which Roscoe felt for his great teachers and the enthusiasm with which he pursued the work that was opened out before him. In the pages of the book before us there is evidence that Sir Henry

Roscoe has maintained that enthusiasm throughout his long connexion with science, and that it was one of the chief factors in attracting to his laboratories in Owens College men who learnt from him to devote their best energies to the subject of which he was so inspiring a teacher.

There is much to attract serious attention in the chapters on his work in Manchester and on his connexion with the early movements for technical education. The leading part which Roscoe played in the creation of the Victoria University and in the fostering of scientific education within its walls is a matter of history. The effect of his marked ability and organizing powers on the development of technical education may be read into rather than in his accounts of its growth and progress.

The later chapters deal with his political life, with his work on the Pasteur Commission, and with his relation to the University of London, and the book ends with a short description of his home life, which Sir Henry Roscoe's readers may well hope will continue to bring him the happiness due to him after so useful and distinguished a career.

*Frederick York Powell.* By OLIVER ELTON. Vol. I. Memoir and Letters ; Vol. II. Writings. (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1906.) 21s. net.

THERE is much in the volumes of 'memoriae' of the late Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford which should deeply interest Churchmen. He was a man much admired, and indeed beloved, in a very wide circle, not only among men of learning but among artists in letters and painting, among those who are but loosely attached to the ordinary conventions of modern English society, and among political agents of types the most 'advanced' and strange. But at the same time he was heartily admired by many leading ecclesiastics, and he returned the admiration. In the memoirs of this utterly unclerical, even anti-clerical, man there is a charming passage in eulogy of certain bishops and another in praise of Liddon. He wrote more fairly and with more sympathy and understanding of the English Church than any other man ever wrote who disbelieved the Christian faith. The biography which Professor Elton has written, very largely from letters, with really extraordinary skill, is one which all thoughtful people should read. It describes a type which is far from uncommon to-day—the man who without a bitter or ungenerous thought passes religion wholly



by, as regards his own life, who clearly regards the Church's teaching as a fable, yet does not go out to the attack, or seek helpers in his unbelief, or vary in the least in his generous kindness to believers. Powell was a very exceptional man ; he had a wonderfully wide knowledge of every subject in which man in all the centuries has been interested—there was no subject in which a specialist in it would not find him well informed—a statement which could, perhaps, in his generation be true of no other man ; not one of those whose ultimate opinions he shared was to be compared to him in width of outlook ; and yet, on analysis, his religious position can only be explained—if that be any explanation—on some theory of an ' *anima naturaliter pagana* ' ; he was constantly reminding those who knew him, among a host of other strange affinities, of Pater's Denys l'Auxerois. He seemed to belong to another age than our own ; and yet not one other age, but many ; and all the time he was full to the brim of ideas, the most modern of all. The man who was the friend of Liddon, and Creighton, and Paget was also the friend of Verlaine, and R. A. M. Stevenson, and Stepniak, and W. B. Yeats, and yet again W. P. Ker, and Vigfusson, and Freeman, and many pure historians, pure scholars, and plain folk in every class of life. It was characteristic of him that he placed together in a dedication a great Dean of Christ Church and a humble fisherman, equally characteristic that he could talk wisely of the most delicate art with an artist and of the most revolutionary schemes with an anarchic chimney-sweep. The man is in truth profoundly interesting. His hasty judgements, as we see them in his letters, are interesting ; so are his reviews (scraps of them are now collected in vol. ii.), most of which were probably at least as interesting ; so were his profoundly serious judgements in history, his survey of the reign of Queen Victoria, his vigorous denunciation of Calvin, his unfeigned regret at the Reformation (which, he once wrote, ' ruined art and divided society '), his critical weighing of Mahomet, or Madame de Krudener, or Napoleon, or Sir Walter Raleigh ; so were his acute yet generous estimates of contemporary historians, such as Freeman (whom he ranked high, but not too high), Froude (whom he ranked low, yet not too low), Gardiner, and Creighton. His own achievements, in any permanent form, were slight ; probably the greatest of them, which belonged to the literature and history of Teutonic heathendom, were almost entirely due to his great inspirer, the Icelandic Vigfusson. But he most deeply influenced, at a critical point in their career, many young men, and set them on

the right track as students—serious, conscientious, systematic (which he never was), unselfish, and generous (which he always was). He certainly, with all his pagan spirit, leaves behind him the sense of his having been a great helper, and there could be no part in life more Christian than that. He had hosts of friends, and every one of them, we may be sure, was the better for his friendship. It is such a memorial that reaches us in these volumes, a cairn on which scores of hands have placed each his stone. The words of the Dean of Christ Church say as well as it can be said why his *Life* is one to be seriously read.

‘We knew him as a true and loyal friend, enlivening all intercourse with brilliant talk illustrated from his stores of learning and wide experience of human life; we knew him to be generous up to and even beyond the limits of prudence, profoundly sympathetic with oppressed people, stirred to his depths by the tragedy and pain of life; we knew him to be sincere, consistent, incapable of weak and unreal compromise—and this especially in those matters where he differed profoundly from the usual beliefs of men. What was the full history of his attitude on these questions, no man knows, nor can we presume to sit in judgement upon it. If he stood outside the kingdom in this life, he was surely one who was not far from its gates. God will know all about it, and may God grant him light!’

*Ronsard and La Pléiade.* With Selections from their Poetry and some Translations in the Original Metres. By GEORGE WYNDHAM. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1906.) 5s. net.

To bring home the beauties of French Renaissance poetry to those unable to appreciate the sixteenth-century French in which it is written is apparently the laudable ambition of the author of this volume. This we may conclude from the prose translations of the introduction, which gives, in sixty pages, a brightly-written survey of the literary period, with such slight bibliographical indications, that the lay reader will, with a few exceptions, hardly know whether to ascribe all or none of the results arrived at to the author. Such details may be left to the ‘wooden compilers of literary manuals,’ to whom the author pays the solitary compliment of going out of his way to give them some hard knocks.

The introduction would lead one to suspect an acquaintance with metrical theory far behind that practical mastery of metres which is displayed in the final section of the book. On page 33 we read: ‘What, then, did the Pléiade effect? They settled decisively . . . that rhyme is at once a necessity for lyrics in modern languages which have no definite quantities,

and a treasure added to the economy of classic verse; that modern poetry, based on the number, and not on the time-value, of syllables in a line, must be contrived in consonance with the ancient songs and genius of European languages. . . . ' If we really could argue the question of 'modern poetry' and 'European languages' in these simple and comprehensive terms, it would save a great deal of the trouble caused by the eternal warring in English of the principles of stress and syllabism.

The real interest of the book lies in the translations. Here the author certainly achieves a large measure of success in the essential task of the poetical translator, in that, namely, of bringing home to us, by the production of poetry in our mother tongue, the poetical worth of his original, in place of leaving us, as so many do, with only hearsay evidence on the point.

In these fifty pages of translations Mr. Wyndham has added something to English literature. One of his best renderings is that of Belleau's April, while a number of the sonnets are particularly good.

*Captain John Smith.* By A. C. BRADLEY. English Men of Action Series. (London: Macmillan and Co.) 2s. 6d.

THE romantic legend of Captain Smith and the beautiful Princess Pocahontas is familiar by name to most of our readers, but it may be supposed that but few have any clear idea of Captain Smith or of the real work he did towards the formation of the first English Colony on the mainland of the American Continent.

His extraordinary adventures as a soldier of fortune in various European wars are here briefly and carefully set down, adventures which would read like fiction if they were not substantiated by contemporary documents. His trials and difficulties, when he devoted his powers to the service of his own country and in the new settlement of Jamestown in Virginia, are almost incredible. Three hundred years ago the first little company reached the new land on the Virginian coast, sent out by the London Virginian Company, acting under Royal Charter. As a return for the royal favour, the first settlement was named after the King, and the two capes which bound Chesapeake Bay received the names Henry and Charles after the two Princes.

Earlier private attempts to establish colonies on the Eastern coast of North America had failed, but from the landing of the party under the Royal Charter of 1606 there has been a permanent English settlement there. The foolish administration, the absurd

rules laid down in London for the guidance of the infant colony, the rivalries among the settlers are all vividly portrayed in this little book, which, without any endeavour to belaud the man who is the central figure of the story, sufficiently shews how exceedingly able and far-seeing he was, and how different would have been the fortunes of the colony if he had been given the care of it from the first.

The famous story of his relations with the Indian Princess has now been stripped of the veneer of improbable details with which its truth had been obscured by the lovers of romance, and it is of great interest and very curious. He died a disappointed and neglected man, but had lived to see flourishing colonies along that New England coast which he had discovered and named, colonies based on the principles he had for years laid down as essential to real prosperity and which have borne abundant fruit.

This work is of special interest at the celebration of the third centenary of the foundation of the first English Church on the American continent at Jamestown in Virginia.

#### PERIODICALS.

*Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. VIII. No. 30. January 1907. Frowde). Bishop of Ely: 'The Lord's Command to Baptize' (Matt. xxviii. 19). G. St. Clair: 'Israel in Camp: a Study.' "Astro-theology." Genesis and Exodus in relation to the Zodiac. H. Pope, O.P.: 'III Esdras and the Tridentine Canon.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'Codex Taurinensis (Y),' VII. Sophonias. E. O. Winstedt: 'A Coptic Fragment attributed to James the Brother of the Lord.' MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Copt. 129. Dom R. H. Connolly: 'The Original Language of the Syriac Acts of John.' Syriac. H. St. J. Thackeray: 'The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings.' E. Bishop: 'Spanish Symptoms.' Influence of the Visigothic Church on those of England and Ireland. W. Emery Barnes: 'Not a Gloss (II Kings xv. 30 b).' A. Souter: 'A Tenth-Century Fragment of Tertullian's *Apology*.' MS. xcv. in the Kantons-Bibliothek, Zürich. R. H. Malden: '*Quicumque vult saluus esse.*' Dom E. C. Butler: 'Funk *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*.' A. Souter: 'Holder *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, I.' J. Hunter Smith: 'E. A. Abbott *Silanus the Christian*.'

*The Expositor* (N. S. Nos. 13-15. January-March 1907. Hodder & Stoughton). H. A. Redpath: 'Christ, the Fulfilment of Prophecy.' W. L. Walker: 'Christ's Preaching of the Kingdom.' C. Anderson Scott: 'Dr. Swete's Edition of the Apocalypse.' J. H. A. Hart: 'Scribes of the Nazarenes. II. The Gospel according to Luke and the Descent into Hades' (March. III. The Reed and the Courtier). Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Pisidian Antioch' (*continued* March). J. Moffatt: 'Notes on recent N. T. Study.' February. Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Professor Harnack



on Luke.' J. Stalker: 'Robert Rainy.' J. Rendel Harris: 'Sons of Thunder.' W. H. Bennett: 'The Life of Christ according to St. Mark' (*continued*). A. E. Garvie: 'The Agony in the Garden.' G. C. Martin: 'The Epistle of James as a Storehouse of the Sayings of Jesus.' A. R. Gordon: 'Job' (*continued* March). March. Dean Bernard: 'The *Magnificat*.' B. W. Bacon: 'Lucan v. Johannine Chronology.' T. Barns: 'The Number of the Beast: a warning against Mithras Worship.' J. Rendel Harris: 'Irenaeus on the Apostolical Preaching.'

*The Hibbert Journal* (Vol. V. No. 2. January 1907. Williams & Norgate). A. Campbell Fraser: 'Our Final Venture.' A. O. Lovejoy: 'The Entangling Alliance of Religion and History.' P. Sabatier: 'La Crise religieuse en France et en Italie.' G. G. Coulton: 'The Failure of the Friars.' R. S. Conway: 'The Messianic Idea in Vergil.' R. J. Campbell: 'The Christian Doctrine of Atonement as influenced by Semitic Religious Ideas.' H. Rashdall: 'A Grave Peril to the Liberty of Churchmen: the Ecclesiastical Discipline Report.' C. S. Patton: 'The New Theism.' F. F. Grensted: 'The Eternal "Now" in Anglican Theology: a Point of Contact between the New Theism and the Old.' H. MacColl: 'Chance or Purpose?' B. de Sélincourt: 'The Parallelism of Religion and Art: a Comment on William Blake.' W. R. Boyce Gibson: 'A. Peace Policy for Idealists.' Discussions. L. Campbell: 'T. Gomperz Greek Thinkers.' Lengthy. W. Harris: 'W. S. Palmer *An Agnostic's Progress*' and '*A Modern Pilgrim's Progress*.' T. K. Cheyne: 'Briggs Psalms, I.' (*Int. Crit. Comm.*). J. Drummond: 'J. H. Moulton *Grammar of N. T. Greek, I.*' and 'E. A. Abbott *Johannine Grammar*.' F. W. O. Ward: 'W. J. Williams *Newman, Pascal, Loisy and the Catholic Church*.' C. B. Welland 'Ovenden *Problems in Life and Religion*.' J. Moffatt: 'Schmid *The Scientific Creed of a Theologian*.'

*The American Journal of Theology* (Vol. XI. No. 1. January 1907. Chicago University Press). H. C. Mabie, P. Carus, F. A. Christie: 'Has Christianity the Moral Right to Supplant the Ethnic Faiths?' F. Giesebrecht: 'The Moral Level of the O. T. Scriptures.' A. A. Forrest: 'The Cry "Back to Christ": its Implication.' F. C. Porter: 'The Sufficiency of the Religion of Jesus.' B. B. Warfield: 'Africa and the Beginnings of Christian Latin Literature.' W. Rauschenbusch: 'The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology.' H. W. Wright: 'An Immutable Absolute or a God who Strives?' C. R. Gregory: 'Critical Note: 1 John v. 7, 8.' Reviews. 'Driver *Job*.' 'Cobb *Psalms*.' 'Duhm *Das Buch Habakuk*.' H. A. A. Kennedy: 'The Life of Jesus in the Light of Recent Discussions.' J. H. Moulton: 'Abbott *Johannine Grammar*.' Lengthy. F. H. Foster: 'H. C. Sheldon *System of Christian Doctrine*.' F. H. Geselbracht: 'The Character of Modern Preaching in Germany.' W. T. Paullin: 'Arnal *La Personne du Christ et le Rationalisme allemand contemporain, I.*'

*The Princeton Theological Review* (Vol. V. No. 1. January 1907. Princeton University Press). W. P. Armstrong: 'The Resurrection and the Origin of the Church in Jerusalem.' J. B. Kelso: 'Mediaeval Mariolatry.' J. P. Hoskins: 'German Influence on Religious Life and Thought in America during the Colonial Period.' C. E. Erdman: 'Modern Practical Theology.' A. Brummelkamp: 'Revision of Article XXXVI

of the *Confessio Belgica*.' J. De Witt: 'Relations of Church History to Preaching.' Reviews. B. B. Warfield: 'W. H. Fitchett *The Unrealized Logic of Religion*;' 'Biesterveld *De Jongste Methode voor de Verklaring van het N. T.*;' 'E. v. Dobschütz *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*' (E. T.); 'Grützmacher *Hieronymus*;' 'Charteris *The Church of Christ*.' K. D. Macmillan: 'Ungnad *Babylonisch-Assyrische Grammatik*.' W. P. Armstrong: 'D. Smith *The Days of His Flesh*.' L. B. Crane: 'Ramsay *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*.' P. P. Flournoy: 'Sanday *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*.' C. Martin: 'R. J. Campbell *The Song of Ages: Sermons*.' Alas! Alas! F. W. Loetscher: 'Nitobé *Bushido, the Soul of Japan*.'

*The Dublin Review* (Vol. CXL. No. 280. January 1907. Burns & Oates). 'Lord Acton and the "Rambler."' 'Church and State in Spain.' Dom Chapman: 'The Condemnation of Pope Honorius.' W. Barry: 'The Liturgy of Toledo.' Reviews 'Férotin *Le Liber Ordinum*.' 'W. H. Kent: The Gaelic Revival.' 'Robert, Earl of Lytton, Statesman and Poet.' Mgr. W. F. Brown: 'The Education Bill of 1906.' Lord Hugh Cecil: 'Lord Rosebery's "Randolph Churchill."' R. Balfour: 'René Bazin's Apology for French Catholics.' F. Y. Eccles: 'The Fame and Failure of Ronsard.' Reviews 'G. Wyndham *Ronsard and la Pléiade*.' Notices. 'W. J. Williams *Newman, Pascal, Loisy*.' 'Abbott Silanus *the Christian*.' 'P. S. Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi*.' 'H. M. Vaughan *The Last of the Royal Stuarts*.' 'Briggs and von Hügel *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch*.'

*The Interpreter* (Vol. III. No. 2. January 1907. Simpkin, Marshall). F. R. Tennant: 'Points of Contact between Theology and Science of the Present Day, II.' F. J. F. Jackson: 'Israel and Babylon, II.' A. H. McNeile: 'Israel in the Time of the Judges.' G. Tandy: 'Elementary Studies in Biblical Criticism, II. The Question of Authorship.' H. Johnson: 'The Spirit of the Early European Missionaries: a Study in St. Luke's Gospel.' F. W. O. Ward: 'The Parable of the Parousia.' H. D. A. Major: 'The Treatment of Dogma in our Teaching and Preaching.' Reviews. 'Abbott Silanus *the Christian*.' 'Swete *Apocalypse*.'

*The Jewish Quarterly Review* (Vol. XIX. No. 74. January 1907. Macmillan.) G. E. Biddle: 'A Theist's Impressions of Judaism.' I. Elbogen: 'Studies in the Jewish Liturgy.' A. Cowley: 'Bodleian Geniza Fragments, IV.' MS. Bodl. Heb. a. 3. L. Ginzberg: 'Geonic Responsa' (continued). J. H. A. Hart: 'The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus.' H. S. Q. Henriques: 'The Political Rights of English Jews.' S. A. Cook: 'Notes on O. T. History' (continued). S. Fyne: 'Psalm cxxxiii.' A. F. Steuart: 'Jews in Rome, 1704.' S. Poznański: 'Zu dem sendschreiben des Nehemia Gaon.' Reviews. I. Elbogen: 'G. Margoliouth *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum*, II.' Lengthy. L. Blau: 'The Extraordinary Points in the Pentateuch.' N. Bentwich: 'Husik Judah Messer Leon's Commentary on the "Vetus Logica."' A. Wolf: 'Hirschfeld Judah Halevi's *Kitab al Khazari*;' 'Bäck *Das Wesen des Judentums*.' I. A[brahams]: 'Bibliography of Hebraica and Judaica, Oct.-Dec. 1906.'

*The Expository Times* (Vol. XVIII. Nos. 4-6. January-March 1907. T. and T. Clark). J. MacConnachie: 'The Liberal Movement in Germany'

(continued Feb.-March). F. Hommel: 'The Ark of Jahweh.' V. McNabb: 'The Christ of the Fourth Gospel.' 'The Fourth Gospel.' 'Skeat and Blagden *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*.' J. Denney: 'Gennrich *Die Lehre von der Wiedergeburt*.' C. B. Upton: 'A. Monod *Aux Croyants et aux Athées*.' W. M. Ramsay: 'New Evidence on the Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom.' P. W. Schmiedel: 'The Article *Gospels* and the Preface to Neumann's *Jesus*.' February. R. B. Taylor: 'J. A. Selbie.' A. Deissmann: 'The New Testament in the Light of recently discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World' (continued). R. Mackintosh: 'Prof. Gwatkin on Revelation.' A. H. Sayce: 'The Archaeological Analysis of the Book of Genesis.' J. Hunter Smith: 'Decease' ('Exodos'). E. Nestle: 'In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.' Not due to St. Augustine but to Peter Meiderlin of Augsburg (Saec. XVII). A. L. Williams: 'A Modern Jonah.' Disposes of the story in Hastings' *Dict. Bible*, ii. 750. W. J. Moulton: 'Duhn *Das Buch Habakuk*.' March. W. Sanday: 'Prof. Burkitt on the Gospel History.' A. Souter: 'A suggested Relationship between Titus and Luke.' II Cor. xii. 18, viii. 18. W. H. Daubney: 'The Song of the Three.' J. Iverach: 'O Holtzmann, *Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaft*.' J. S. Banks: 'Recent Discoveries.' The new work by Irenaeus published in *Texte und Untersuchungen*.

*The Review and Expositor* (Vol. IV. No. 1. January 1907. Louisville, Ky.) P. Carnegie Simpson: 'The Problem of Pain.' J. Iverach: 'Attempts to eliminate the Supernatural from the Gospel History.' W. T. Whitley: 'The Epistle to the Hebrews, x. 19 to end.' W. Ashmore: 'The Kingship of Jehovah.' D. Walker: 'The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians.' S. C. Mitchell: 'The Preacher for the Present South.' J. Ten Broeke: 'The Theoretical Value of Moral and Religious Experience.' Reviews. J. R. Sampey: 'Orr *The Problem of the Old Testament*.' (12 pages). E. C. Dargan: 'Brastow *The Modern Pulpit*.' W. J. McGlothlin: 'J. C. H. Williams *Life of Sir George Williams, Founder of the Y. M. C. A.*' 'Harnack *Militia Christi*.' B. H. de Ment: 'Agar Beet *Manual of Theology*.' W. O. Carver: 'Ballard *Haeckel's Monism False*.' Haeckel is very little read in America. A T. Robertson: 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt*.' Blass *Die Rhythmen der Asianischen u. Römischen Kunstprosa*.' 'Swete *Apocalypse*.'

*The Independent Review* (Vol. XII. Nos. 40-42. January-March 1907. John Lane). E. Dimnet: 'The Crisis in France.' H. Paul: 'The Victorian Drawing-Room: Lady Dorothy Nevill's *Memoirs*.' J. A. Hill: 'The Fallacies of Materialism.' D. MacCarthy: 'Belloc *Hills and the Sea*' and 'W. H. Hudson *The Crystal Age*.' February. E. O. Fordham and R. M. Ferguson: 'The Small Holdings Committee.' H. H. Henson: 'The National Church and the Education Bill—a Retrospect.' C. H. Roberts: 'Some Words on Local Veto.' Hon. B. Russell: 'The Development of Morals.' H. Rashdall: 'A Mediaeval Herodotus.' Salimbene. M. Strachey: 'Wyndham Ronsard and *La Pléiade*.' J. W. Headlam: 'The Hohenlohe *Memoirs*.' D. MacCarthy: 'Tourguénief.' March. A. Galton: 'The New Theology of the City Temple.' L. T. Hobhouse: 'Sociology and Ethics.' G. L. Strachey: 'The First Earl of Lytton.' G. M. Trevelyan: 'A Puritan Henry George.' Gerrard Winstanley.

J. L. Hammond: 'O. M. Edwards *A Short History of Wales*.' D. MacCarthy: 'Three Books on Russian Literature.'

*The Quarterly Review* (No. 410. January 1907. Murray). R. E. Prothero: 'The Growth of the Historical Novel.' 'The Charity Organisation Society.' C. H. Herford: 'Ruskin and the Gothic Revival.' W. Miller: 'The Dukes of Athens.' G. Saintsbury: 'Balzac and M. Brunetière.' 'British Sea Fisheries.' 'Recent Developments of Old Testament Criticism.' I. Taylor: 'The Hôtel de Rambouillet.' G. S. Street: 'Lord Randolph Churchill.' 'The Memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe.' 'The Ecclesiastical Crisis in France.'

*The Classical Review* (Vol. XXI. Nos. 1-2. February-March 1907. Nutt). J. P. Postgate: 'Rutilius, the last of the Pagans.' R. E. Macnaghten: 'The Character and Language of the Athenians.' 'Excavations at Manchester.' March. W. H. S. Jones: 'Quintilian, Plutarch and the Early Humanists.' J. H. Moulton: 'Frazer *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*.' G. Macdonald: 'Head Coins of Phrygia.'

*The Contemporary Review* (Nos. 493-5. January-March 1907. Horace Marshall). P. J. MacLagan: 'Christian Missions and the Civil Power in China.' L. M. Philipps: 'Santa Sophia.' E. Martinengo Cesaresco: 'The Growth of Modern Ideas on Animals.' R. Heath: 'Peasant Insurrections, 1381 and 1525.' Criticizes 'Oman *The Great Revolt of 1381*.' A. P. Nicholson: 'Manet and Monet.' T. J. Macnamara: 'The Education Bill and After.' 'J. Oman *The Problem of Faith*.' 'Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.' 'H. E. P. Platt *Last Rambles in the Classics*.' February. E. M. Caillard: 'A Psychological Puzzle.' A most curious study in Personality. J. F. Wilkinson: 'Government and Discipline in the Church of England.' J. Mew: 'Yiddish Literature and Drama.' 'R. Finot *Race Prejudice*.' 'Dennett *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*.' 'Cairns *Christianity in the Modern World*.' 'Montmorency Thomas à Kempis.' March. E. Sellers: 'The State Children of Hungary.' Goldwin Smith: 'Canada, England and the States.' T. H. Weir: 'Higher Criticism and the Koran.' C. D. Burns: 'The Use of Names in the Gospel of St. Mark.' 'Carroll *Prisoners of Hope—an Exposition of Dante's "Purgatorio"*.' 'Driver *Jeremiah*.' 'C. F. Kent *Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament*.'

*The Catholic World* (Vol. LXXXIV. Nos. 502-4. January-March 1907. New York.) G. M. Searle: 'The Recent Results of Psychical Research' (continued March). J. J. Keane: 'The Catholic Hierarchy.' L. E. Lapham: 'Fogazzaro and his Trilogy.' R. H. Benson: 'The State of Religion in England.' J. J. Fox: 'The Relations of Church and State' (continued March). Reviews. 'Alston *Stoic and Christian in the Second Century*.' 'McTaggart *Some Dogmas of Religion*.' February. M. D. Petre: 'The Fallacy of Undenominationalism.' A. Lloyd: 'A School of the Prophets for Japan.' Reviews. 'Bréhier *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age: Les Croisades*.' 'Briggs and Von Hügel *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch*.' March. F. Aveling: 'Mr. Campbell's New Theology.' K. Brégy: 'The Poetry of Aubrey de Vere.' M. M. Maxwell Scott: 'The Nuns of the Visitation at Rouen, 1792-1807.' Reviews. 'Giraud *Questions d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Chrétienne*.' 'H. Paul *History of Modern England*.'



*The Monthly Review* (Nos. 76-8. January-March 1907. Murray). W. H. Mallock: 'The Intellectual Condition of the Labour Party, III.' E. E. Williams: 'Temperance and the Statute Book.' G. S. Street: 'Ghosts of Piccadilly—81 and 82.' (February 'Albany,' March 'Byron.') C. de la Warr: 'Jane, Duchess of Gordon.' A. E. Keeton: 'Johannes Brahms, 1833-1897.' A. Cecil: 'J. A. Froude.' L. Jerrold: 'France and the Pope's Move.' February. R. Grant: 'A Boer Poet.' W. du Plessis. E. A. Pratt: 'Humanity and Stimulants.' A. Symons: 'Dante and Botticelli—a Renaissance Study.' J. Vaughan: 'George Crabbe as a Botanist.' A. R. Colquhoun: 'The Secret of Japanese Patriotism.' J. A. Hill: 'Spiritualism.' S. L. Bastin: 'The British v. the American Horticulturists.' March. G. W. Prothero: 'Frederick York Powell.' G. Biagi: 'The Mind and Manners of a Florentine Merchant of the Fourteenth Century.' 'Sir O. Lodge *The Substance of Faith allied with Science.*'

*The Edinburgh Review* (No. 419. January 1907. Longmans). 'The Age of Reason.' 'The Old and the New Alchemy.' 'Egypt: the Old Problem and the New.' 'Catholic Authority and Modern Society.' 'Tradition in Art.' 'The English Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century.' 'The Italian Garden.' 'Insular Fiction.' 'The State of Russia.'

*The English Historical Review* (Vol. XXII. No. 85. January 1907. Longmans). E. J. Webb: 'The Alleged Phoenician Circumnavigation of Africa.' F. M. Powicke: 'The Angevin Administration of Normandy, II.' L. F. Brown: 'The Religious Factors in the Convention Parliament.' 'Mary Bateson.' H. W. C. Davis: 'An Unpublished Life of Edmund Rich.' Balliol College MS. 226, Lambeth Library MS. 135, Cambridge University Library M.M. 4. 6 (Saec. XIII.). C. L. Falkiner: 'William Farmer's Chronicles of Ireland.' G. F. Warner: 'An Unpublished Political Paper by Daniel De Foe.' MS. Brit. Mus. Lansdowne 98. Reviews. H. J. White: 'Brochet S. *Jérôme et ses Ennemis.*' A. Souter: 'Rand *Johannes Scottus.*' C. V. Langlois: 'H. W. C. Davis *History of England, 1066-1272*' and 'Tout *Hist. Eng. 1216-1377.*' J. Tait: 'Oman *The Great Revolt of 1381.*' P. F. Willert: 'Lord Acton *Lectures on Modern History.*' E. M. Leonard: 'B. K. Gray *History of English Philanthropy.*' G. McN. Rushforth: 'Overton and Relton *The English Church from George I to End of Eighteenth Century.*' Sir S. Walpole: 'Brodrick and Fotheringham *History of England, 1801-1837.*' 'Head *Greek Coins of Phrygia.*' 'Mollat *Lettres communes de Jean XXII.*' 'Vogt *Erzbischof Mathias von Mainz, 1321-8.*' 'Waltz *Fr. Bartolomé de Las Casas.*' 'Vaughan *The Last of the Royal Stuarts.*' 'Whitaker *History and Criticism of the Labour Theory of Value.*' 'Elton F. York Powell.' 'Humphreys *Somersetshire Parishes.*' 'Roper *Materials for the History of the Church of Lancaster, III, IV.*'

*The Economic Review* (Vol. XVII. No. 1. January 1907. Rivingtons). W. Temple: 'Christian Education in Elementary Schools.' J. A. Dale: 'Bournville.' G. Crosse: 'The Poplar Workhouse Inquiry.' M. J. Lauder: 'Imprisonment for Debt.' H. W. Wolff: 'Collective Landholding in Italy' and 'Friendly Societies in Italy.'

*Revue Biblique Internationale* (N.S. Vol. IV. No. 1. January 1907. Paris: Lecoffre). A. van Hoonacker: 'Notes d'exégèse sur quelques

passages difficiles d'Osée.' Hos. iv 4-5, 18; v 1, 2, 11; vi 8-9; vii 3-7; viii 6; ix 13. H. Coppieters: 'Le Décret des Apôtres (Acts xv 28-9).' P. Dhorme: 'Le séjour des morts chez les Babyloniens et les Hébreux.' Mgr G. Mercati: (1) 'S. Isicius'; (2) 'I frammenti esaplari del *Chronicon Paschale*'; (3) 'Lo Scritto Atanasiano *De Azymis* è spurio.' M. J. Lagrange: 'Le Livre de la Sagesse, sa doctrine des fins dernières.' M. Abel: 'Notes d'archéologie chrétienne sur le Sinaï.' Illustrated. R. Savignac: 'Création d'un sanctuaire et d'une tradition à Jérusalem'; 'Les fouilles de Megiddo.' Reviews. A. Condamin: 'Briggs *Psalms*, I (*Int. Crit. Comm.*).' P. Dhorme: 'J. de Morgan *Recherches archéologiques en Perse*.' H. Vincent: 'Petrie *Researches in Sinai*.' 'Heigl *Verfasser u. Adresse des Briefes an die Hebräer*.' 'E. A. Abbott *Johannine Grammar*.'

*Revue Bénédictine* (Vol. XXIV. No. 1. January 1907. Maredsous). D. De Bruyne: 'Prologues bibliques d'origine Marcionite.' H. Schuster: 'L'abbaye de Farfa et sa restauration au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle.' G. Morin: 'Un critique en liturgie au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le traité inédit d'Hervé de Bourgdieu *De correctione quarundam Lectionum*'; 'A propos des fragments grecs de Jérôme sur les Psaumes, publiés dans les *Anecdota Maredsolana*'; 'Notes d'hagiographie toscane.' V. Berlière: 'Les évêques auxiliaires de Théroutanne'; 'Une lettre de Frédéric de Laroche, évêque d'Acre et archevêque de Tyr, 1153-1161'; 'Statuts du Chapitre général bénédictin de la province de Sens, Mai 1299.' P. de Meester: 'Le *Filioque*. Étude de théologie orthodoxe.' H. Quentin: 'Un témoignage sur le *Codex Corvinianus* des Épîtres de S. Ignace'; 'Jean de Jérusalem et le Commentaire sur les Évangiles attribué à Théophile d'Antioche.' I. Guidi: 'La liste inédite des diptyques de la Liturgie de Lucques à l'époque lombarde.' Reviews. B. Lebbe: 'A. d'Alès *La Théologie de S. Hippolyte*.' P. Bastien: 'Galante *Fontes iuris canonici selecti*.' U. Berlière: 'Grisac *Histoire de Rome et des Papes au Moyen Âge*, I.'

*Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique* (Vol. VIII. No. 1. January 1907. Louvain). A. d'Alès: 'L'auteur de la *Passio Perpetuae*.' Tertullian. P. Fournier: 'Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales, V' (*fin*). A. Fierens: 'La question franciscaine. Le MS. II. 2326 de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, I.' L. Willaert: 'Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas catholiques (1598-1625). II. L'intervention des Archiducs en faveur du catholicisme en Angleterre.' Reviews. J. Flamion: 'Grutzmacher *Hieronymus*' et 'Turmel *S. Jérôme*.' M. Vaes: 'Keller *Die sieben römischen Pfalzrichter im byzantinischen Zeitalter*.' J. Warichez: 'Moeller *Histoire du Moyen Âge*.' P. de Puniet: 'Magistretti *Manuale Ambrosianum*.' J. B. Goetstouwers: 'Launay *Journal d'André Ly, prêtre chinois, missionnaire et notaire apostolique, 1746-63, texte latin*.'

*Analecta Bollandiana* (Vol. XXVI. No. 1. January 1907. Brussels). P. Peeters: 'Une version arabe de la Passion de S. Catherine d'Alexandrie.' From a MS. found at Homs in 1902. G. Vielhaber: 'De *Codice hagiographico C. R. Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis Lat. 420 (olim Salisburg. 39)*.' Of Ninth, not Eleventh Century, and important. H. Moretus: 'Les deux anciennes Vies de S. Grégoire le Grand.' The Life by Bede and that by the Monk of Whitby are independent. A. Poncet: 'Les Miracles de S. Willibrord.' H. Delehaye: 'Le Témoignage

des Martyrologes.' Reviews. P. P[eters]: 'Duchesne *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, I'; 'Nau *Histoires d'Ahoudemmeh et de Maronta* (Patr. Or. III.).' H. D[elehaye]: 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt, Mission und Ausbreitung, Militia Christi*.' V[an] O[r]troy: 'Pastor *Geschichte der Papste*, IV Leo X.'

*Revue des Questions Historiques* (Vol. XLI. No. 161. January 1907. Paris). P. Allard: 'Une grande fortune romaine au V<sup>e</sup> siècle.' H. Baraude: 'Le siège d'Orléans et Jeanne d'Arc' (*fin*). M. Dubruel: 'Innocent XI et l'extension de la Régale, d'après la correspondance confidentielle du Cardinal Pio avec Léopold I<sup>er</sup>.' Pietsch: 'Un prêtre français en exil. L'abbé Gabriel Henry, curé d'Iéne (1795-1815) et ses relations avec Napoléon I<sup>er</sup>.' V. Ermoni: 'Lucius *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in den christlichen Kirche*.' Pierling: 'Dmitri dit le Faux d'après Waliszewski *Les Origines de la Russie Moderne*.' H. de Landosle: 'Lettre inédite de S. Vincent de Paul à Magdeleine de Lamoignon, 1652.' Reviews. 'Martini-Bassi *Catalogus codd. Graec. biblioth. Ambrosianae*.' 'A. d'Alès *La Théologie de S. Hippolyte*.' J. M. Besse: 'Monceaux *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*: III. *Le IV<sup>e</sup> siècle*.' M. Besnier: 'Allard *Dix Leçons sur le Martyre*.' G. Péries: 'Knecht *System des Justinianischen Kirchenvermögensrechtes*.' P. Allard: 'Leclercq *Les Martyrs*, IV-V.'

*Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* (Vol. XI. 6-XII. 1. November 1906-February 1907. Paris: Picard). P. de Labriolle: 'L'argument de prescription, II.' A. Dupin: 'La Trinité dans l'école modaliste jusqu'à la fin du III<sup>e</sup> siècle.' M. Masson: 'Fénelon et Mme Guyon. I. La Correspondance secrète. II. (Jan.-Feb.) Histoire d'une amitié mystique.' A. Loisy: 'Chronique Biblique.' Jan.-Feb. L. de la Vallée Poussin: 'Introduction à la pratique des futurs Bouddhas, par Cantideva' (*suite*). A. Loisy: 'Wellhausen *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*.' Lengthy notice.

*Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique* (December 1906-March 1907. Paris: Lecoffre). L. Maisonneuve: 'La philosophie religieuse de M. Brunetière' (*suite* Jan.-Feb.) Mgr. Batiffol: 'L'édit de Calliste d'après une controverse récente.' January. 'Brunschvieg *L'idéalisme contemporain*.' February. J. Mahé: 'La date du commentaire de S. Cyrille sur S. Jean.' 'Prat *Origène, le théologien et l'exégète*.' 'J. Martin *Gustave Wasa et la réforme en Suède*.' March. A. Degert: 'Une œuvre nouvelle de S. Irénée.' E. Albert: 'Mar Qiore, L'Eucharistie chez les Nestoriens au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle.' 'Lecanuet *L'Église de France sous la III<sup>e</sup> république*, 1870-78.'

*Studi Religiosi* (Vol. VI. No. 6-VII. 1. November 1906-February 1907. Firenze). F. Mari: 'La dimora dei morti presso i Babilonesi e gli antichi Ebrei.' D. Battaini: 'Il rinascimento cattolico in Inghilterra.' S. Minocchi: (1) 'Il P. Tyrrell e la sua *Lettera confidenziale* (Un conflitto tra la Fede e la Teologia?).' (2) 'Ipnotismo e Spiritismo.' 'Religione e superstizione.' Reviews. 'Schell *Apologie des Christentums*.' 'Profumo *Le fonti e i tempi dell' Incendio Neroniano*.' 'Schmidt *Acta Pauli*.' 'Künstle *Anti-Priscilliana*.' 'Monceaux *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, III-IV.' 'Burn *Niceta of Remesiana*.' 'Baudrillart *Quatre cents ans de Concordat*.' S. Minocchi: 'Versione di Isaia, lvii 14-lx 21.' January-February. G. Semeria: 'Chi ha scritto *l'Imitazione di Cristo*? ' L. Franceschi: 'La Biologia moderna e la ipotesi dell' Evoluzione.' L. Caetani di Teano: 'Bisanzio e la Chiesa orientale alla vigilia della Invasione

araba.' Reviews. 'Briggs and Von Hügel *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch*.' 'Dudden *Gregory the Great*.' S. Minocchi: *Genesi*, i-ii 4.'

*Teologisk Tidsskrift* (Vol. VIII. No. 1. 1906. Copenhagen). A. Møllerup: 'David Hume. En Taenkersaga fra Rationalismens Tid.' V. L. Petersen: 'Kulturkampen i Frankrig.' F. Torm: J. Weiss *Das älteste Evangelium*' and 'Hoffmann *Das Marcusevangelium u. seine Quellen*.' C. T. Lund: 'Christensen *Pauli Liv fortalt og Pauli Brev til Romerne*.'

*The East and the West* (Vol. V. No. 17. January 1907. S.P.G.). Bp. Montgomery: 'Canada.' Sir T. Holdich: 'Characteristics of the Afghan.' Bp. of Madras: 'The Progress of Christianity in India and Mission Strategy.' E. F. Brown: 'Mission Work among the Educated Classes in India.' Bp. of Rangoon: 'The Indian Empire and the Church of England, or some Claims of the Indian Empire on the Church and the Church's Answer.' E. S. Oakley: 'Missions and Modern Hinduism.' W. S. Macgowan: 'Some Aspects of Education in S. Africa.' G. Whitehead: 'Buddhism in Burma.' Reviews. 'D. Kidd *Savage Childhood: a Study of Kafir Children*.' 'W. G. Aston *Shinto*.' 'J. D. Parsons *The Nature and Purpose of the Universe*.'

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be reviewed in Short Notices or Articles as space permits.

#### BIBLICAL AND KINDRED STUDIES.

ALLEN, W. C.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*. 'International Critical Commentary.' Pp. xcvi+338. (T. and T. Clark.) 12s.

BRIGGS, C. A., and E. G.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. Vol. II. 'International Critical Commentary.' Pp. viii+572. (T. and T. Clark.) 10s. 6d.

CHAMBERLAIN, J. S. ff.—*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle newly rendered with Notes*. Pp. 676. (Elliot Stock.) 3s. 6d.

\_\_\_\_\_ *Gospel Notes*. Pp. ii+118. (Stock.) 2s.

\_\_\_\_\_ *John's Revelation. Being the Vision of St. John Interpreted*. Pp. 128. (Stock.) 1s.

CORNILL, C.—*Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by G. H. Box. 'Theological Translation Library,' Vol. XXIII. Pp. xii+556. (Williams and Norgate.) 10s. 6d. net.

DU BOSE, W. P.—*The Gospel according to St. Paul*. Pp. viii+304. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

'INTERPRETER.'—*The Fourfold Portrait of the Heavenly King as presented in the Gospels*. A New Translation of the Gospels side by side with the Authorised and Revised Versions, Quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures, and Parallel Passages arranged to facilitate Comparison of the Gospel Narratives. Pp. xvi+306. (Elliot Stock.) 1l. 11s. 6d.

KNIGHT, H. J. C.—*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and Philemon*. 'Churchman's Bible.' Pp. xii+208. (Methuen.) 2s. net.

LEIPOLDT, J.—*Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. I. *Die Entstehung*. Pp. viii+288. (Leipzig: Hinrichs.) 3 m. 60. See Article.



MAYOR, J. B.—*The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter. Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Comments.* Pp. xvi + 100 + 120. (Macmillan.) 14s. net.

'MOTTA'—*The Cryptogram and its Key in the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia.* Pp. 106. (Elliot Stock.) 2s. 6d. net.

PRICE, I. M.—*The Ancestry of our English Bible: an Account of the Bible Versions, Texts, and Manuscripts.* Pp. xxiv + 330. (Philadelphia: Sunday School Times Co.) 6s. 6d. net.

PROBY, E. B. (the late).—*The Minor Prophets with a Commentary Explanatory and Practical, and Introductions to the Several Books.* Vol. IV. *Micah.* Vol. V. *Jozah and Nahum.* Pp. 300, 332. (Nisbet.) 2s. 6d. each net. Two more volumes of a very cheap reprint.

REYNOLDS, D.—*The Date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* Pp. viii + 72. (Cambridge University Press.) 2s. net.

SALMON, G. (the late).—*The Human Element in the Gospels.* A Commentary on the Synoptic Narrative. Edited by N. J. D. WHITE. Pp. xxv + 350. (Murray.) 18s. net. See Article.

SMITH, SER. W.—*A Smaller Dictionary of the Bible for the use of Schools and Young Persons.* With Maps and Illustrations. Pp. vi + 618. (Murray.) 2s. 6d. net. Extraordinarily cheap.

WORKMAN, G. C.—*The Servant of Jehovah; or, the Passion Prophecy of Scripture analysed and elucidated.* Pp. xxvi + 250. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

#### PHILOSOPHY AND APOLOGETICS.

ASEWIN, C. G.—*Thoughts about God, Man, Evil, and Kindred Subjects.* Pp. 44. (Elliot Stock.) 2s. net.

LE DANTEC, F.—*The Nature and Origin of Life in the Light of New Knowledge.* With an Introductory Preface by R. K. DUNCAN. Pp. xvi + 250. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s. net.

MITCHELL, W.—*Structure and Growth of the Mind.* Pp. xxxvi + 512. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

PRATT, J. B.—*The Psychology of Religious Belief.* Pp. xii + 328. (The Macmillan Co.) 6s. 6d. net.

ROGERS, A. K.—*The Religious Conception of the World: an Essay in Constructive Philosophy.* Pp. vi + 286. (The Macmillan Co.) 6s. 6d. net.

SCHILLER, F. C. S.—*Studies in Humanism.* Pp. xviii + 492. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

TURTON, LT.-COL. W. H.—*The Truth of Christianity, being an Examination of the more Important Arguments for and against Believing in that Religion.* Sixth Edition, carefully revised throughout. Pp. viii + 570. (Wells Gardner.) 2s. 6d. net. Interesting, useful, and very cheap, but still not quite fair to the 'Higher Critics.'

#### CHURCH HISTORY.

BRUCE, H.—*The Age of Schism.* Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 1304 to A.D. 1503. Pp. viii + 278. (Rivingtons.) 3s. 6d. net. 'The Church Universal,' Vol. V.

LEA, H. C.—*A History of the Inquisition of Spain.* Vol. III. Pp. xii + 576. (The Macmillan Co.) 10s. 6d. net.

LINDSAY, T. M.—*A History of the Reformation*. Vol. II. The Reformation in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, Scotland, and England. The Anabaptist and Socinian Movements. The Counter-Reformation. 'International Theological Library.' Pp. xviii+632. (T. and T. Clark.) 10s. 6d.

PLUMMER, A.—*English Church History from the Death of Charles I. to the Death of William III.* (1649–1702). Four Lectures. Pp. xii+188. (T. and T. Clark.) 3s. net.

ROMANES, E.—*The Story of Port Royal*. Pp. xxiv+504. (Murray.) 15s. net.

WHITNEY, J. P.—*The Reformation*. Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 1503 to A.D. 1648. Pp. viii+502. (Rivingtons.) 5s. net. 'The Church Universal,' Vol. VI.

#### DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

ALLEN, A. V. G.—*Freedom in the Church; or, the Doctrine of Christ as the Lord hath Commanded, and as this Church hath Received the same according to the Commandments of God*. Pp. xvi+224. (The Macmillan Co.) 6s. 6d. net.

ECK, H. U. S.—*Sin*. 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' Pp. xii+242. (Longmans.) 5s.

LODGE, SIR O.—*The Substance of Faith allied with Science*. A Catechism for Parents and Teachers. Pp. xii+136. (Methuen.) 2s. net.

MENABBE, V.—*The Decrees of the Vatican Council*. Edited with an Introduction. Pp. 48. (Burns and Oates.) 2s. net.

MOBERLY, R. C. (the late).—*Atonement and Personality and Ministerial Priesthood*. Pp. xxviii+418, lvi+360. (Murray.) 6s. each net. Two admirable re-issues at a cheaper price.

*The Religion of a Layman*. Being Studies of various subjects—the Serious Reflections of a Long Life. Together with a Review of the Westminster Confession of Faith. Pp. iv+226. (Edinburgh: Waddie and Co.) 5s. net.

#### SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

BARING-GOULD, S.—*The Restitution of All Things; or, 'The Hope that is set before us.'* Pp. 182. (Skeffingtons.) 3s. 6d.

\_\_\_\_\_ and others. *Plain Sermons on Sunday Observance*. With Prefatory Note by H. B. OTTLEY. Pp. 94. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. 6d. net.

BUSSELL, F. W.—*Christian Theology and Social Progress*. The Bampton Lectures for 1905. Pp. xl+344. (Methuen.) 10s. 6d. net.

HANKEY, W. B. (the late).—*The Church and the Saints*. Edited by M. K. C. STRONG. Pp. xvi+194. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

HEPHER, C.—*The Self-Revelation of Jesus*. Pp. viii+116. (Wells Gardner.) 2s. 6d.

HOLLAND, H. S.—*Vital Values*. Pp. viii+228. (Wells Gardner.) 3s. 6d.

INGE, W. R.—*Personal Idealism and Mysticism*. The Paddock Lectures for 1906 delivered at the General Seminary, New York. Pp. x+186. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.



KNIGHT, H. J. C.—*The Temptation of our Lord considered as related to the Ministry and as a Revelation of His Person.* 'Hulsean Lectures, 1905-6.' Pp. xiv+210. (Longmans.) 4s. 6d. net.

LUCKOCK, VERY REV. H. M. (Dean of Lichfield).—*Eucharistic Sacrifice and Intercession for the Departed both Consistent with the Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer.* A Course of Addresses. Pp. xvi+134. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. 6d. net.

MONTGOMERY, C. P. G.—*Some Aspects of the Blessed Eucharist.* Five Sermons. Pp. 52. (Masters.) 1s. 6d. net.

MORTIMER, A. G.—*One Hundred Miniature Sermons.* Being a very full Outline Sermon on the Epistles and Gospels for all the Sundays, Holy Days, and Saints' Days of the Christian Year. Part II. Ash Wednesday to Trinity Sunday. Pp. 161-342. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

TAYLOR, F. J.—*The Apostle of Patience and Practice: a Simple Exposition of the Epistle of St. James.* In xiv. Short Addresses delivered at St. Matthew's, Redhill. Pp. 172. (Allenson.) 2s. 6d.

WATSON, F. (the late).—*The Seven Words from the Cross: a Course of Meditations.* Edited by C. B. DRAKE. Pp. 112. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

WILMOT-BUXTON, H. J.—*God's Heroes.* A Series of Plain Sermons. 'Sermon Library, Vol. VII.' Pp. x+234. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

WILSON, J. M.—*The Day School and Religious Education.* Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. Preached in Worcester Cathedral, January 6, 1907.

#### DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

ATWOOL, H. C.—*At His Feet: the Place of Faith in the Incarnate Word.* Pp. x+164. (Wells Gardner.) 2s. 6d.

BRETT, J.—*The Altar and the Life: Meditations on the Blessed Sacrament in Relation to the Development of the Spiritual Life.* Pp. x+216. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

GOOCH, W. F.—*The Christian Union Hymnal.* New edition, revised, with Supplement. Pp. 200. (London: Morgan and Scott.) 1s. 6d.

MACLEAN, F.—*Sunrise.* Pp. 56. (Wells Gardner.) 1s. Chiefly Texts.

MATURIN, B. W.—*Laws of the Spiritual Life.* Pp. vi+282. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

NUTTALL, MOST REV. E. (Archbishop of the West Indies).—*Catechisms and Devotions for Children and Young People.* Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

SLATTERY, VERY REV. C. L.—*The Master of the World: a Study of Christ.* Pp. viii+298. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

TEE, E.—*The Sanctuary of Suffering.* With Preface by (the late) J. P. F. DAVIDSON. New edition. Pp. xii+220. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

TYRRELL, G.—*Oil and Wine.* Reissue with a new Preface. Pp. xx+352. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

LAWRENCE, BROTHER.—*The Spiritual Maxims of Brother Lawrence, together with his Character and Gathered Thoughts.* Newly translated. 'Heart and Life' series. Pp. 58. (Allenson.) 1s. net.

PORTER, R.—*In Quietness and Confidence. Looking towards Sunrise. Open Windows. Resting in His Love.* Pp. 118, 108, 114, 148. (Moring.) 1s. each net. Four little books in the 'Quiet Hour' series.

ROSS, G. A. J.—*The Universality of Jesus.* Pp. 182. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 2s. 6d. net.

WALSHAM HOW, BISHOP (the late).—*Pastor in Parochia.* Pp. xii + 464. (Wells Gardner.) 3s. 6d. A beautiful little pocket edition on thin paper with added services and prayers.

#### PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

BEACHEY, R. W.—*God, Man, and the Garden : Puzzles, Problems and Parables solved by the Word of God.* Pp. xii + 270. (Elliot Stock.) 5s.

BRASTOW, L. O.—*The Modern Pulpit : a Study of Homiletic Sources and Characteristics.* Pp. xxiv + 452. (The Macmillan Co.) 6s. 6d. net.

HARNACK, A., and HERRMANN, W.—*Essays on the Social Gospel.* Translated by G. M. CRAIK. 'Crown Theological Library.' Pp. x + 226. (Williams and Norgate.) 4s. 6d.

HILTY, C.—*The Steps of Life : Further Essays on Happiness.* Translated by M. BRANDOW, with an Introduction by F. G. PEABODY. Pp. x + 264. (The Macmillan Co.) 5s. net.

SLICER, T. R.—*The Way to Happiness.* Pp. viii + 172. (The Macmillan Co.) 5s. net.

#### HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

*The Cambridge Modern History.* Vol. IV. *The Thirty Years' War.* Pp. xxx + 1004. (Cambridge University Press.) 16s. net. See Notice.

FARNELL, L. R.—*The Cults of the Greek States,* Vols. III. and IV. Pp. xii + 394, viii + 454. (Clarendon Press.) 32s. net.

INNES, A. D.—*History of England for the use of Schools.* Pp. xvi + 606. (Cambridge University Press.) 4s. 6d.

JONES, E. A.—*The Old Church Plate of the Isle of Man.* Pp. xxxii + 34. (Bemrose.) 10s. 6d. net.

LETHABY, W. R.—*Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen : a Study of Mediæval Building.* Pp. xvi + 382. (Duckworth.) 12s. 6d. net. See Article.

SOUTTAR, R.—*A Short History of Mediæval Peoples from the Dawn of the Christian Era to the Fall of Constantinople.* Pp. viii + 682. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 12s.

#### BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

ADDAMS, J.—*Newer Ideals of Peace.* 'Citizen's Library.' Pp. xviii + 244. (The Macmillan Co.) 5s. net.

BREMOND, H.—*The Mystery of Newman.* Translated by H. C. CORRANCE. With an Introduction by G. TYRRELL. Pp. xviii + 360. (Williams and Norgate.) 10s. 6d. net.

DALE, E.—*National Life and Character in the Mirror of Early English Literature.* Pp. xiv + 338. (Cambridge University Press.) 8s. net.

GRIER, G.—*Our Sister Beatrice : Recollections of Beatrice Julian Allen and her Letters.* Pp. x + 296. (Longmans.) 10s. 6d. net.

HOUTIN, A.—*La Crise du Clergé.* Pp. 348. (Paris : E. Nourry.) 3 fr. 50.

MAETERLINCK, M.—*Life and Flowers.* Translated by A. TEIXEIRA DE MATOS. Pp. viii + 312. (George Allen.) 5s. net.

SANDFORD, VEN. E. G.—*The Exeter Episcopate of Archbishop Temple, 1869-1885.* Pp. xiv + 366. (Macmillan.) 5s. net. A reissue of part of the *Memoirs of Archbishop Temple.*



WEALE, B. L. P.—*The Truce in the East and its Aftermath*. Being the sequel to *The Reshaping of the Far East*. Pp. xvi+648. (Macmillan.) 12s. 6d. net.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

BATHE, A.—*Eastertide with Jesus*. Pp. viii+152. (Longmans.) 6d.

BULKELEY, H. J.—*The Religious Teaching of English History in Church and School*. A paper read at the Carlisle Diocesan Conference, 1890, republished, with a few Alterations, an Introduction, an Appendix containing some National Hymns and Psalms and a Preface by the BISHOP OF HEREFORD. Pp. 24. (Elliot Stock.) 1s. net.

DALE, R. W. (the late).—*History of English Congregationalism*. Completed and edited by A. W. W. DALE. Pp. xii+788. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 12s. net.

DEARMER, P.—*The Parson's Handbook*. Containing Practical Directions both for Parsons and others as to the Management of the Parish Church and its services according to the English use, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. With an Introductory Essay on Conformity to the Church of England. Pp. xxii+562. (Frowde.) 6s. net. Sixth edition, revised a second time with much additional matter, and with thirty-one illustrations.

FRERE, W. H., and DOUGLAS, C. E.—*Puritan Manifestoes*. A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt with a Reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and kindred Documents, 1572. 'Church Historical Society,' LXXII. Pp. xxxii+156. (S.P.C.K.) 7s. 6d.

HYDE, J.—*A Bibliography of the Works of Emanuel Swedenborg, original and translated*. Pp. xviii+744. (Swedenborg Society: 1 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.)

KNIGHT, W.—*On the Art of Public Speaking and Reading*. An Address delivered to the Theological Students of the Bishop of Worcester's College at Hartlebury. Pp. 30. (S.P.C.K.) 2d.

MORGAN, T. T. L.—*The Teaching of the Temple; or, the Pictorial Rise of the Catholic Church*. Pp. viii+272. (Rivingtons.)

*Proposals for a Voluntary Nobility*. Pp. 32. (Samurai Press: Ranworth Hall, Norwich.) 2s. net.

RUSSELL, G. W. E.—*A Plea for Easter Offerings*. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. 6d. per 100.

THACKERAY, F. ST. J.—*Sunday at Marby Castle*. Pp. 58. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

*The Convocation Prayer Book*. Being the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England. With altered Rubrics, showing what would be the condition of the Book if amended in Conformity with the Recommendations of the Convocations of Canterbury and York contained in Reports presented to Her Majesty the Queen in the Year 1879. Pp. iv+576. (Murray.) 5s. net.

*The Education Crisis*. Letters on the subject by the DEAN OF CANTERBURY, DR. CLIFFORD, and others. Pp. 28. (S.P.C.K.) Reprinted from the *Times*, January 1907.

*The Meaning of Religious Education*. By W. CUNNINGHAM. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 1d.